

Exclusiveness :

— A —

LECTURE FOR CHRISTMAS EVE,

DELIVERED

ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 24, 1855,

BY THE

REV. DR. T. W. COIT,

RECTOR OF ST. PAUL'S CHURCH,

TROY, NEW YORK.

Non semper pendebit inter latrones Christus : resurget aliquando
crucifixa veritas.—(Castalio's Letter to Calvin.)

TROY, N. Y.:
WILLIAM H. YOUNG, 216 RIVER STREET.
1856.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1856,
BY WM. H. YOUNG,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Northern District of New York.

D. H. JONES & Co., PRINTERS,
TROY, N. Y.

TROY, February 2d, 1856.

TO THE REV. DR. COIT—

DEAR SIR: —

The subscribers respectfully request the use of the manuscript of your Lecture, delivered in St. Paul's Church, on Christmas Eve; our object being to have it published, and so presented, in an authentic shape, to a community whose attention has been called, through a Daily Press, to what we presume to have been a very imperfect Sketch, reported for one of the papers of the city, soon after its delivery. We believe that the appearance of the Lecture in print, at the present time, will be favorably appreciated by very many of our own, and of other Christian denominations. Submitting the matter to your judgment, we remain,

Very truly your friends,

E. C. PATTISON,
THO. A. TILLINGHAST,
JOHN B. TIBBITS,
HENRY TATOR,
WM. H. YOUNG,
GEO. B. WARREN, JR.,
WILLARD GAY,
ISRAEL R. CATLIN,
CHAS. S. HEARTT,
JOHN W. PAINE,
JAMES FORSYTH.

TROY, February 25, 1856.

REV. DR. COIT—

DEAR SIR: —

Having been informed that a number of the members of St. Paul's Congregation, have requested you to permit the publication of the Lecture, delivered by you on last Christmas Eve; and believing it to be the general wish of the congregation, that you should comply with the request, the undersigned, members of the Vestry, desire to express their earnest wish that you will, as soon as convenient, furnish a copy for publication, with such explanatory notes as you may deem it proper to append.

With great respect and esteem,

We are your obedient serv's,

DAVID BUEL, JR.,
I. McCONIHE,
N. DAUCHY,
JONAS C. HEARTT,
A. S. PERRY,
J. M. WARREN,
J. J. GILLESPIE,
JOHN B. TIBBITS,
C. R. RICHARDS,
THOS. C. BRINSMADE.

TROY, February 28, 1856.

TO MESSRS. PATTISON, AND OTHERS, MEMBERS OF THE CONGREGATION OF ST PAUL'S
CHURCH; AND TO MESSRS. BUEL, AND OTHERS, MEMBERS OF ITS VESTRY—

GENTLEMEN : —

Your communications (the first of them especially,) ought, perhaps, to have received earlier attention. I began the preparation of my manuscript for the press, as soon as I could, after receiving the letter of February the second; and a notice that the Lecture would be printed "in a few days," appeared in the Troy Daily Times, on February the fourth. This, if nothing more, ought to have suspended all animadversions upon, what its hard critic acknowledged to be, a mere sketch. But he kept steadily on; and the necessity for explaining and vindicating matters greatly misrepresented, has much retarded my progress, amid the many interruptions and avocations of a large parish. I am at length drawing my work to a close; and have already committed it, in part, into the hands of the printer.

I am, with unfeigned esteem and affection,

Your friend and pastor,

T. W. COIT.

TO THE PUBLIC.

The following Lecture was delivered last Christmas Eve, in St. Paul's Church, in this city ; where I had a perfect right to deliver any discourse I might think proper, to any congregation before me. It was not written, or designed, for publication ; indeed, the publication of it, when requested immediately after its delivery, was respectfully declined. It is some ten or eleven years old ; and was, therefore, composed long before I came to Troy, where I have been a resident scarcely two years. It has been delivered on different occasions, in places widely distant from each other ; and has never, heretofore, to my knowledge, been a cause of offence to those who heard it. On the contrary, the part which seems, at length, to have given as much umbrage as any — where it is maintained that charity cannot justly be predicated of opinions, but must be predicated of the feelings and temper with which we hold opinions—was assented to by a very intelligent Socinian, who candidly admitted, that Socinians could not claim to be more charitable than others, because they happened to have a more liberal system of theology.

In Troy, the Lecture has met with a fate altogether unusual in its history. A sort of report of it got into a public newspaper, without the privity, the consent, or even the knowledge of myself. Indeed, until a friend informed me of it, and loaned me the newspaper, (one I did not take, and never saw,) I was not aware that such a thing was in existence. This mere newspaper sketch was seized upon by Dr. Beman, the minister of a New-School Presbyterian congregation in this city ; and, although he was fully advertised, in the very newspaper where he commenced his assault, that the responsible original would be ready for him “in a few days,” he clung like a leech to the irresponsible sketch, and made it the object of an attack so petulant, as to arraign me, not for its language

only, but for its rhetoric and its grammar. The trifling courtesy of a single question addressed to myself, the trifling forbearance of "a few days," might have saved him from the awkward and ungentlemanly predicament into which he has thrust himself, and the needless trouble of twelve elaborate papers, in which he unflinchingly quotes as mine, what I never wrote a word of, attributes to me sentiments I have never avowed, answers statements I have never maintained, and censures the literary peccadillos of nobody cares who.

A man who puts himself into such a predicament, through a lack of common civility, and, while in the thickest of it, says it is a courteous rule to hear a person before you censure him, and then commends to an unheard and unwaited for neighbor (for so does he to me) a consideration of the Divine Commandment about bearing false witness, renders himself, aside from the bad manners and sorry morality of his position, an object for mirthful pity.

But Dr. Beman seems to have a *penchant*, as he admits, for the extravagant figure, hyperbole; and cannot restrain himself, though his own mistakes are the puppets that dance in it. Not content with one brood of ludicrous errors, he forthwith hatches a second. He travels out of his way to exhibit me, in contradistinction from my good brother, the Rector of St. John's, as an enemy to societies for the distribution of the Holy Scriptures—representing that brother, as condescending to preach on the anniversary of such a society, while "surrounded by multitudes belonging to other denominations," and the whole scene as a foreshadowing of Heaven! Now—*incredibile dictu*—myself, and my assistant, were both of us present on that ante-celestial occasion, and conducted Divine Service, while my accuser was absent. "A blessed picture," he most lovingly calls it; but, alas, not a ray of light from his amiable countenance irradiated its beauty.

Once more. He says, in one of his papers, that he has "no sensitiveness of a denominational character." By which I naturally suppose he means, that he cares not a farthing for Presbyterianism as such. He need not, in this way, have informed this community, who know him so well, that he is a self-constituted champion, who, while he *appears* to be fighting a legitimate battle, is *really* contending for mere personal victory. His long life of warfares of all sorts, had satisfied them upon this point to the utmost; and it needed not a more formal attestation. Thersites never informed the ancient Greeks in writing, that he talked contentiously and incessantly, for his own sake, and not for that of others. He was his own "living epistle."


And now, dragged as I am before the public, and by such an adversary, if I were to turn upon him, as Tertullian did upon heretics, I believe that many would not think me unjustifiably chiding. This primitive Father said of such persons, "Take away from them their railing, they have not a word to utter." But I am not disposed, if I can help it, to pass over from a self-defensive position, and become an assailant. The servant of the Lord must not strive, as an Apostle says, i. e., (as his own Greek has it,) *fight*. (II Tim., ii. 24.) But he may, as another Apostle even enjoins, stand upon the defensive; or, as *his* own Greek has it, be always ready for an apology — using the word apology in its ancient, and not in its modern sense—as a manly and fearless act of self-justification. (I Peter, iii. 15.) This, *Deo adjuvante*, it is my wish and purpose to be, and to inflict upon Dr. Beman no heavier retaliation, than to ask his careful attention to the following sentiment, of that eminent example of common sense and practical wisdom, Abp. Tillotson. "There is no readier way for a man to bring his own worth into question, than by endeavoring to detract from the worth of other men."

Such, substantially, was what I had sketched as an address to the public, before the appearance of Dr. Beman's last paper. The slurs and insinuations of that paper, pointed at my integrity, may call for something more pungent, in my conclusion. And if so, no man, around me or abroad, who values that "good name" which Scripture itself glorifies, will wonder at language which, otherwise, I would gladly have been excused from.

Troy, N. Y., March 1, 1856.

T. W. C.

P. S. — I have made explanations, and added notes and references, which I should not have done for a mere controversy with Dr. Beman, and never for the sake of display. It is of very little consequence to me, as an Episcopalian, what Dr. B. may or may not think, may or may not say, of my theological sentiments. But is of some consequence to me to stand, if possible, *rectus in curiâ*, in my own communion. So I have done what I should not have done for Dr. Beman's sake, or a thousand more like him; and perhaps students of theology, if no others, will not be sorry to keep my pamphlet for reference. If any of my sentiments or expressions are unacceptable to a solitary member of my own communion, I shall only say, with quiet old Joseph Mede, "I can with much patience endure a man to be contrary-minded" from myself; and that, therefore, if he will afford me tolerance, I can extend the same benefaction, when his turn comes to undergo the ordeal of public scrutiny.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

LECTURE.

“FOR THE JEWS HAVE NO DEALINGS WITH THE SAMARITANS.”—*John* iv. 9.

THE present occasion, my brethren, is one which, so far as I am familiar with its usages, is generally devoted to what in ancient times were called “apologetics,” i. e. discourses apologising for, or vindicating, some of those peculiarities which distinguish us from the denominations by which we are surrounded. I shall deem myself, therefore, not trespassing, but conforming to custom and expectation, if I bring before you some matters, which concern us, not so much individually, as in our relations to others. Of course, it must be my endeavor to do so, with a clear recollection of that grand law of charity, which, while it allows great plainness of speech in respect to the *opinions* of our fellow-creatures, demands a kind judgment for their hearts; because *motives* are known only to God, and by God only can be scrutinized and judged. Our Litany teaches us to pray, continually, not merely for the forgiveness of our *sins*, but also for the forgiveness of “our negligences and ignorances.” And, surely, we who supplicate habitually and earnestly for the pardon of our own negligences and ignorances, ought to make due allowance for the negligences and ignorances of others; and, most especially, of those whom we believe to have been not as well instructed as ourselves.

With these views, as an explanation and guide, I shall now consider myself at full liberty to speak, with all frankness and explicitness, upon one of the constant topics of complaint, with which our Church is assailed, and now assailed more vehemently if possible than ever, viz: its exclusiveness. We, it is said, are striking parallels to the language which has been chosen as a text. We look upon ourselves, as the Jews of old did, as the sole favorites of Heaven—as the sole true Church—and upon those around us, as the Samaritans, with whom, in religious concerns most certainly, it is best to have no dealings.*

The objection is stated, I trust, strongly and fully enough, to satisfy our most captious opponents. And if so, and this is what is meant by our utter exclusiveness, that we put ourselves foremost in respect to what we believe to be the truth, concerning God's Church, God's Word, and God's Worship—then we simply do that, which every sect around us does, and are no more guilty than they. Does not the Presbyterian, and the Baptist, and the Methodist, and the Quaker, believe his own way of getting to Heaven better than that of any of his neighbors? does he believe it a matter of "mere form," to use the common phraseology—a thing of pure indifference—whether one adopt, or not, *his* peculiarities of doctrine, discipline and worship? If so, in the awful Name of God I ask him, how dare he then call himself by a distinct name, place himself within a distinct communion and speak of that as a Christian Church? What! rend the body of Christ for perfect matters of indifference, when that body is, and can be, but one—when there is but one Lord, one faith, and one baptism, and not a hundred—and when, of course, there can be but one exact truth about either, and that which departs from this exactness must, of necessity, be error in some degree or other—in a less degree, most clearly, if not a greater? This were a sin of formidable character; since, how mild soever towards man, it would be severe towards Christ, and would be excluding what he had laid down as law, in order to be popular with the world—an exclusiveness which he will requite, by being ashamed of it, and its abettors, in the day of judgment.

Now, they have no idea, not the slightest, of being chargeable

* Note A.

with such a crime as this. What remains then, but that they admit that it is *not* for matters of pure indifference, but of high moment, that they have dissociated themselves from their fellow-christians, and govern themselves by rules of their own devising? What, in other words, but that they confess that they think *their own* pattern of Christianity, nearest the pattern of the New Testament, and of apostolic and primitive times—as, therefore, the fairest exhibition, now to be found, of Christianity on earth, and consequently the surest and safest way to Heaven.*

Either the sects believe this, one and all, and each one for, and of itself; or, it is condemned out of its own lips, as a mere schism, if not a rank heresy, and that without any excuse whatever.

Then they do believe it, one and all, and each one for, and of itself. And, my brethren, we believe only and simply the same thing. We have no manner of doubt, *any more than they have*, that our form of Christianity is that form of it, which existed in the days of our Lord and his Apostles. We believe, *as they do*, that if our Lord himself were to return on earth, He would recognize us as those who professed and practised Christianity, most nearly as He left it. And the result of the whole is, that we believe, *just as the sects do*, and each and all of them, that ours is the best and purest form of Christianity; and that which will most safely and easily transfer us from the Church on earth, to the Church of the First-born, whose names are written in Heaven. And if this is exclusiveness, and there be any thing criminal in it, then we look fearlessly round, upon every sect which upbraids us, and say, The one that is without sin among you, let that one cast the first stone.†

Such, brethren, would be the first answer we might give to those who charge us with being exclusive, viz: that we are no more exclusive *than*, and we are just as exclusive *as*, any other denomination of Christians. They are, as precisely and fully, guilty of the sin of exclusiveness as we, or they convict themselves of the greater sin of wilful schism, or heresy, for acknowledged trifles—or, of the still greater sin of hypocrisy, of practically persisting in those trifles, when they both know and confess

* Note B. † Note C.

their insignificance. Now, we dread the mere charge of exclusiveness, infinitely less than we do the odious fault of schism, or heresy, or hypocrisy; and therefore we say, frankly and fearlessly, what our neighbors say by their conduct, gloss it over with what special pleading they will.*

Yet, after all, some will say, and very pertinently, this is a poor way to prove yourselves innocent, to show that you are no guiltier than others. I know and admit it; and so will review this charge of exclusiveness in a different way. Possibly my second form of argument may satisfy some, who will consider the first too like to that which is called *argumentum ad hominem*, i. e., an appeal to a man's own concessions; although that argument must sometimes be just, for it was employed by our Saviour himself.

Let us come, then, a little closer to our subject, and, if possible, settle its character by a definition. Clear and exact definition is indispensable for the settlement of any vexed question; and, when attainable, soon leads to a result like itself. This is illustrated, a thousand times over, in the demonstrations of mathematics.

What, then, is exclusiveness? Does it consist or lie in the opinions of our minds, or the feelings of our hearts? If exclusiveness is a thing which is to be measured, by our holding more or less of certain opinions — by our adhering to those opinions with more or less laxity — and by our deeming the adoption of such opinions more or less essential — then, the less one believes, and the more loosely one believes, the better: the less exclusive he is, and, of course, the more commendable. Then the Socinian is more praiseworthy than any of those denominations which are usually styled orthodox, because they believe in the Trinity, and the fundamental doctrines which commonly accompany it. For a Socinian insists upon hardly any thing peculiar to Christianity, as an essential of faith, unless it be the doctrine of the Resurrection; and that, by some of his kindred, is about being turned into mysticism or allegory, so that what remains I wot not. The Universalist is less an exclusive than the Socinian, since he saves all, let them *believe*, nay let them *act* as they may: while the Socinian

* Note D.

does believe in a sort of Purgatory for some sinners, or else gives them safe acquittance from all punishment in blank annihilation. The Deist is still less an exclusive, in a matter of immense moment, as the world now goes. Of course, he makes futurity, if he believes in it, quite as safe or consolatory for all sinners, as does the Socinian or the Universalist. But then he never taxes the pocket, as they do, with any troublesome demands for a support of the institutions of Christianity. Churches, Sundays, and Bibles, are all superfluities with him; and his purse pleads a most comfortable exemption from any cost for his soul. The Atheist goes a step further, and discharges us from even the solitary article of faith, which nature cries aloud from all her works. With him, therefore, there is no such thing as sin, or as accountability: man is mere vegetation, he lives and dies like a tree. This, one would suppose, were a freedom from exclusiveness capacious enough for most, bad as they may wish to be. But there is a champion against exclusiveness, who goes a point onward, and crowns the climax. This is the Pantheist, one of the most fashionable of modern unbelievers. The Atheist believes in no God; but, with the Pantheist, all and every thing is God. With him, the heavens are God, the earth is God, man is God, and the brute is God, — every thing that is, or that shall be, is Divine. With him, of course, there is not only no such thing as sin, but every thing must be virtue; for, as every thing is Divine, every thing must be Divinely right, and error and transgression are banished from the universe, totally and forever.

Here, brethren, if opinions are the test, here is the prince of non-exclusives. How do you like his picture? He has a smile for every form of belief, which was ever broached. No action is discountenanced by his frown. Think as you choose, live as you list; and his unwearied plaudit is, Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.

To avoid the sin of exclusiveness, will you call such a man your master? You must, if non-exclusiveness be a virtue, and he who has least of it is most praiseworthy. Do you shrink from such polluting contact? Then shrink from the position, that exclusiveness has aught to do with opinions, with their quantity, their texture, or their color; and believe me when I lay down

the true doctrine upon this subject, viz: that exclusiveness is not a thing to be predicated of *opinions*, but of *feelings*. It is not charity to believe more, or to believe less, than our neighbors. Charity is not a quality of the head; it is a virtue of the heart. If I hold what I do believe, with kindly feelings towards my fellow-creatures, then I am a charitable man; and, if governed by such feelings, I should not be less charitable, were I a Roman Catholic, or more charitable were I a Plymouth Pilgrim.

I need hardly tell you that multitudes make a different version of this subject, and predicate charity of opinions; declaring that this man, or that sect, is more liberal than another, because his or their opinions are more lax, more comprehensive, more latitudinarian. But it is a thorough and absolute mistake, to suppose so. If opinions are the measure of charity, then he who has the fewest of them which trouble anybody, and the most of them which think well of everybody, then the Pantheist, the Captain-general of infidels, is, as has been shown you, the most charitable man, the most glorious non-exclusive in existence. But his dread society frightens us. Let it then frighten us from the false conclusion, that charity is to be measured by the opinions we either hold, or disavow.*

What does an Apostle tell us is the end — *the* end, and not *an* end; for so it is in both the original and our common version — *the* end of God's commandment? Is it not charity out of a pure heart, rather than out of a clear head? Not that he thinks a good conscience, or a correct faith of no moment; since the same passage alludes to both these christian excellencies. But charity out of a pure heart, is the first and foremost quality, its leading and characterizing distinction. And with this agrees his description, in that largest and sublimest portraiture of charity, any where on record, and to be found in the thirteenth of first Corinthians. "Charity beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." How can opinions, which are mere abstractions, do all, or any one, of these things? Opinions cannot bear, or believe, or hope, or endure; but the heart can. I can bear with an errorist, I can believe pitifully of his delusions, I can hope on for him in my wishes and prayers, when many

* Note E.

have given him up to Satan ; I can endure him when he becomes a heretic or a rank apostate ; for God endures him upon the face of his own earth, and who am I to say, that that shall not be borne with, however grievous, which is tolerated by Heaven itself. But I cannot bear to hear his errors pronounced truths or trifles—I cannot believe they are not the errors they are, by any manner of possibility. I cannot hope for his safety, *in*, or *by*, those errors, but *out of*, and *away from* them — I cannot endure to have those errors pronounced, or treated, as verities ; for errors they are to me, and as such I must account and treat them, or I am unfaithful to my own conscience, and a hypocrite to God.

And does not all this show, as plainly as words can show, that charity has to do with my heart, and not my head, with my feelings and not my creed, with my treatment of the motives of others, and not with my treatment of their sentiments? Rely upon it, brethren, this is the true view of a common, but a very commonly mistaken subject. Charity consists not in the believing more, or in the believing less ; but in holding what we do believe, with tolerance and pity and hope and patience, and universally with good will, towards those who differ from us, whether on the one side, or on the other. Calvin, *e. g.*, believed in the doctrine of Predestination, in its most absolute and formidable aspect. Yet his heart relented, as he wrote down his testimony in behalf of a doctrine, which, in his view, involved whole nations and their posterity in remediless destruction ; and he said the decree was one unquestionably horrible. So his feelings dissented from his mind, and he pitied while he doomed. And, if so, he held his opinion, however terrible, in charity ; and, brethren, it were better to be Calvin, and hold even to predestination charitably, than to be called a Saint, and yet hate him for his mere opinion.

Calvin was not to blame for a mere belief in the absolute decree of fating predestination ; but he was to blame, most grievously and inexcusably, for forcing his own opinions upon another. He might have believed in predestination, harmlessly ; but when he assailed heresy with fire, and burned Servetus at the stake, it was idle for him to call himself a Protestant, for he was no longer a protester against Rome's highest claim — the right to enforce

her dogmas by civil power, and temporal pains and punishments.*

The Puritans were not to blame for not believing in surplices, or liturgies, or bishops; and the Church of England admitted as much, for she treated them gently, so long as they were quiet in their dissent. But they were to blame for insisting, as they pertinaciously and inflexibly did, that the Church of England must conform to *their* model — “the pattern in the Mount,” as they styled it — and if she would not, might be overthrown and built anew. For this the Church of England contended with them, and sharply; for she contended for her own existence:† — history abundantly evincing, that she was struggling for very life; since, had Puritanism become as dominant in Old England as in New, there would have been a gallows found for anti-Puritans in London, as well as in Boston, Massachusetts.‡

And now then, let me hope it is sufficiently plain, that charity is an affair which respects feelings, and not opinions, and that we are not more exclusive for believing a great deal, provided we so believe with due deference to the rights of others; nor less exclusive for believing a very little, provided we are disposed to thrust our opinions, or a solitary one of them, upon those whose freedom to form their own faith is equal to our own.

And here, then, is the proper place to ask, how our own Church exemplifies charity, as thus defined? whether, or not, she is chargeable with exclusiveness, as thus properly limited and understood? Remember, brethren, if my explanations are right, (and if they are not, why then the worst infidel surpasses us all in freedom from this terrible exclusiveness, which our opponents harp on as a watchword,) if, I say, my explanations are right, the question now is not, What does our Church believe — whether

* Note F.

† “It is easy,” says the Quarterly Review, “to talk of toleration, and say that the Church should have tolerated these schismatics: they would not tolerate the Church.” (Q. Rev., x. 96.) This intolerance; on their part, went steadily forward, till it refused deliberately, and by a legislative act, all tolerance of Episcopacy whatever; and placed it on the level of blaspheming infidelity. “The [Puritan] Parliament, debating the point of liberty of conscience, gravely resolved to allow it to all, who should not maintain Atheism, Popery, Prelacy, Profaneness, or any damnable heresy.” — (Jones’ Life of Bp. Hall, p. 371.) This was in Jan., 1654; and if a more memorable date, or darker blot, can be found in the records of the Inquisition, let the enemies of Episcopacy produce it.

‡ Note G.

more here, or less there — but, how does she hold her belief, (her professed belief, that is,) towards those who consider themselves without her pale? what is her temper, her state of feeling, towards those who differ from her?

Does she deal in anathemas against other Christians, like the Romish Church at the Council of Trent; where a curse follows every decree, as regularly as an Amen follows a prayer? If so, where are those anathemas to be found? Let our bitterest enemies put their finger upon one.

Does she say that conformity to her own specific views is indispensable to salvation? Her highest statement upon the delicate topic of indispensables to salvation, may be found in her Catechism — where she says, that the Sacraments ordained by Christ are two in number only, and that these are generally, not specifically and in all cases, necessary to salvation;* not denying salvation to any one, therefore, who fails to receive either sacrament, so he be hindered by God's Providence, or through no obliquity of his heart.

And is this assuming too lofty a position, and speaking in a tone too dictatorial? Why the Presbyterian Confession of Faith has even stronger language. That Confession, most authoritatively and solemnly decrees, that the visible Church is the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, "out of which," I give you its very words, "out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation." It must be something altogether extraordinary—an almost miracle, or quite a miracle—according to this Confession, which renders salvation out of the Church, so much as a bare possibility. This is speaking more peremptorily, more stiffly than we do, in the mildly qualified words, that the two Sacraments are generally necessary to salvation; and yet, if I should therefore say, that the Presbyterian standards were more exclusive than our own, alas, how cruelly uncharitable should I be called!

But further, and with another view of this subject. In nothing, perhaps, is the temper of a Church shown, more than in her terms of communion — in those things, that is, which she abso-

* The Greek Church says precisely the same.—(Smith on the Greek Church, pp. 107, 108,—London, 1680.)

lutely insists upon as prerequisites for the enjoyment of her privileges. And if you want to know with what inflexibility these can be laid down, go to the Romish Creed of Pope Pius IV., where a formidable series of dogmas is closed with this tremendous profession and adjuration: "This true Catholic faith, out of which none can be saved, which I now freely profess and truly hold, I, N., promise, vow and swear, most constantly to hold and profess the same, whole and entire, with God's assistance to the end of my life; [and to take care, as much as may be in my power, that the same shall be held, taught and preached, by those who are subject to me, or shall be under my care. So help me God, and these holy Gospels of God.] Amen."* Or, go into those Protestant communities, where the unwritten law of custom, is as imperious as the written law of Rome, and where the state of your heart will be brought under judgment, as mercilessly as your orthodoxy by the Pope, and your piety and prospects for heaven determined, with the same pontifical exactness, simply because you cannot subscribe to the shibboleths of a sect.†

But search now for the requisitions of the Protestant Episcopal Church, when the question is, who shall be baptised in the Name of the Holy Trinity, and admitted to the inestimable privilege of covenant with God. Could the terms on which she consents to be the instrument of imparting such a favor, be made more mild and accessible, than she has made them? She asks a renunciation of the Devil and the World, a belief in the most ancient and simple of all summaries of the Christian Faith, and a promise of dutiful obedience to God's holy law and providential will. Could a community, claiming the name of Christian, well be meeker and gentler, on so great a question as this, Who shall be admitted into God's holy Church, and commended to his immortal benediction? Would "the meekness and gentleness of Christ" himself have opened the doors of mercy wider, or welcomed all who came, on more lenient terms?

Well, then, let us look to her terms of communion, when we desire closer intimacy, fuller admission—in fine, an invitation to

* Charles Butler, Esq., on Creeds.—p. 15. Mr. B. left out the part in brackets, for which Mr. Southey called him to account, in his *Vindiciæ Anglicanæ*, p. 28. See also Percival's *Roman Schism*, p. xlix, and Bp. Bull's *Works*, iii, 249.

† Note H.

all she can grant, as the ministerial dispenser of his mercy, holding the keys of his spiritual kingdom, established by him below. Does she hold those keys with a griping hand, and shut the door to Christ's holy table, as closely as some shut the doors of Heaven's saving mercy? * Hear her own language; for, on this very essential matter, she does not, and I rejoice she does not, trust the discretion of any minister, but chooses herself to say, that "the most comfortable sacrament of the body and blood of Christ" shall be administered — to whom? "to all such," not to a Christian of this name, or of that name — but, "to all such as shall be religiously and devoutly disposed." Nor leaves she the matter there; but, not content with one invitation, she indites a second. "Ye who do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbors, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God and walking from henceforth in his holy ways; Draw near with faith, and take this Holy Sacrament to your comfort, and make your humble confession to Almighty God."

But she does not invite Presbyterians, nor Baptists, nor any other denomination whatsoever. No, for she knows no Christians, by any such names as these, in the most sacred of her services. She knows not even her more immediate members, whom common parlance styles Episcopalians, by any such name, in a service devoted unto Christ, and to his blessed, hallowed memory alone. She knows none there, but those who bear Christ's image on their hearts, his signature upon their souls. She knows none there, as fit partakers of Christ's bounty, but the truly and earnestly repentant, they who have hearts imbued with love and charity, they who intend to lead a new life of devotedness to God, they who have faith to teach them the necessity and duty and propriety of all this — they who are such, she invites to take Christ's holiest sacrament to their comfort. †

* "Elect infants dying in infancy," say the Westminster & Cambridge Confessions, (all I happen to have at hand,) "are regenerated and saved by Christ." Of course, according to the legal maxim, *expressio unius est exclusio alterius*, unelect infants are neither regenerated nor saved. And now if exclusiveness is predicable of opinions, what a horribly exclusive creed is that, which can send poor unsinning babes to everlasting perdition! What mother can read (I will not say adopt it,) without a shudder!

† Note I.

And is not this sufficiently non-exclusive ; for mark ! while she insists upon penitence, and charity, and new obedience, and faith to set the whole in motion and sustain it, she assumes not the prerogative, the Divine prerogative, so often and so easily assumed by mortals, of judging the heart, decreeing the state of the secret soul ; but leaves that most awful function to the individual conscience, acting for itself in the sight of an all-searching God. “Ye who do truly and earnestly repent you,” is her language ; and not, “Ye whom I consider such, by rules of my own devising.” And, in no one thing, perhaps, does she more fairly exhibit her genuine catholicity — her freedom from Popery on the one hand, and Ultra-Protestantism on the other, than in this particular. Popery judges the *head* without mercy : you must profess the Creed of Pope Pius, or you are lost forever. Ultra-Protestantism judges the *heart* without mercy : the heart must respond to its favorite dogmas, or you are equally a candidate for perdition. And, if I *must* judge between the two, I feel bound in justice to say, that the former judgment is the lighter. For, with a head destitute of orthodoxy, one may be saved ; and even Rome holds out hope to such an one, when his head is under the veil of “invincible ignorance.” But, with a heart destitute of piety, who can be saved, by any possibility whatever ?*

And is not this the predicament in which many and many an ultra-protestant sectarian presumes us to be placed — nay, sternly adjudges us to be ? How many of our neighbors, in the Protestant denominations round us, find it easy or pleasant to believe in an Episcopalian’s piety ? On the contrary, how many are there who do not find it easy to call him a cold, dead formalist — a believer in the virtue of a liturgy destitute of devotion, of sacraments destitute of faith, of a church destitute of all inward life — a mere nominal representation of Christ’s genuine body ; which, nevertheless, he looks to as a sort of Noah’s ark, which is to obtain him a charmed security, and convoy him safely over the waves of a troublesome world, to a haven of rest in God’s bosom ?†

I think I may speak plainly ; for I have known the handling

* Note J.

† Compare Puritanism, or a Churchman’s defence, &c., p. 24.

which our church has experienced, for many a year, from those around her, who in Protestantism are her kindred, and whom she has never repelled from her altars. I am satisfied that they think quite as poorly of our pretensions to piety, as Rome does of our pretensions to orthodoxy. And yet, if I know anything correctly of my own communion, I am confident of this, that while Episcopalians think freely and speak freely of the *opinions* of other Christians, they are less free than any Christians I know of, in their judgments of the unseen condition of a fellow-creature's soul. But, according to the doctrine respecting the nature of true charity, this is charity in the best sense of that holy word, it is charity in feeling and in temper; and charity of that kind in relation to the dearest concern that any mortal has, or can have—the state of his soul in the sight of God. And, not to say that we learn this from the Bible itself, we learn it more familiarly, perhaps, from the practice of our Church herself, who opens her arms, like the father of the prodigal, to the truly penitent and believing, without asking what human name they go by.

Nevertheless, the calumny flies round and round, that if any Christian communion is pre-eminently exclusive, we are that one; unless, perhaps, the Romish Church may be slightly in advance of us — not much, however; for though our Church has fought the battles of Protestantism, more bravely and memorably than any communion on earth, we are believed to be as false to Protestantism, as we are to God, and to be nothing but Romanists in disguise. And will nothing satisfy our opponents, but our utter extermination? Will their untiring denunciation over us be that of the children of Edom, in the day of Jerusalem, Raze it, raze it, even to the foundation thereof? (Psalm, cxxxvii. 7.)

But I must tear myself from this subject, brethren, though I have not said all, nor half of all, which was revolved in my solitary, shall I say mournful thoughts. There is no comfort in criticising the unkindness of fellow-christians. But there is still less of comfort in submitting to injustice; and if self-vindication wrings plain speech from us, be it remembered, that if plainness is ever justifiable to an extremity, it is in the vindication of character. The harsh charge of exclusiveness is one to which we cannot tamely bow. It must be met, and I trust it has been met,

without shrinking. It can be met again and again ; for more has been left unsaid, than has found utterance, and future years may furnish an echo to what is now begun.

Meanwhile, let us leave our cause to that high Guardian of truth, who, and who only, can bring forth judgment unto victory. Truth has fallen in the street, and equity not been able to enter, in many and many an age of the Church's history. But the Church has survived it all, and she lives still, the would-be mother of us all, to pillow our heads with the last and only rest worth having — the rest that remaineth for the people of God. It may be that tribulation is before us, rather than quiet ; humiliation, rather than triumph ; mourning, rather than joy. Be it so, if it can be for Christ's sake, and the Church's sake which is his body, and for which he disdained not the abasement of death itself. "It is a faithful saying," said one soon to be a martyr for his Redeemer — who while he spake was ready to be offered, and the time of whose departure was at hand — "It is a faithful saying, For if we be dead with Christ, we shall also live with him ; if we suffer, we shall also reign with him." Nay, said the same fearless voice, to the unfeigned believer, All things are yours, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, *i. e.*, whether the Church, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come — all are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's. (I Cor. iii. 22.)

Can there be a happier, a sublimer destiny than this ?

God grant it to you for his mercy's sake, my brethren : and unto him, through Christ his Son, be the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty, forever. AMEN. (I Chron. xxix. 11.)

NOTICE.

The division of Religion into the three parts of Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship, is familiar enough to Episcopalians; for these very words occur in the Service for the Consecration of Bishops, in the oath of conformity taken by a candidate for the Episcopate. It is familiar enough too in the old Divines, whether Episcopal or not. But, to some who may read the following Notes, it may not be amiss to say, that by *Doctrine*, is meant that part of Religion which embraces theological doctrines, properly speaking; by *Discipline*, that part of it which relates to the constitution and government of the Church; and by *Worship*, that which relates to forms and modes of worshipping God.

NOTES.

NOTE A.

Jews and Samaritans.

Among other mischievous perversions of my sentiments, this passage was eagerly pounced upon, to prove that I formally represented the Episcopal Church as occupying the place of the ancient Jewish Church, and others, as occupying the ground of the Samaritan schismatics. Whereas, what I actually say is, that this is the representation which our enemies themselves make of our position. I make no such representation myself, but quote it as the aspersion of a foe! The next moment I find it put into my own mouth as mine! The thing is of no great consequence in itself;

and is referred to in my first note, to show the extreme unfairness with which I am assaulted. Language is quoted as mine, over, and over, and over again, which is not only in no sense mine, but which, were it libellous, might subject those who perversely misappropriate its authorship, to an action for slander.

NOTE B.

An appeal to antiquity for a model church.

When the thing comes to a practical test, every denomination strives, at once to show its conformity to the primitive pattern; and thus sets up a church-likeness to the primitive model, as a thing justifying, indeed requiring, its independent position as an ecclesiastical organization. Thus, Cotton Mather, in his *Magnalia*, contends for the Apostolicity of Congregationalism, and claims that church-order is an essential matter. (*Mag. Introd.* § 3; *Bk. iii.* § 2) John Cotton, the so styled "Patriarch of New England," wrote his elaborate treatise on the Power of the Keys, and his "Way of the Congregational Churches cleared," "to systematize and defend Congregationalism," and to ward off the effects of the powerful volume of Samuel Rutherford* on "The Due Right of Presbyteries;" where John Robinson, the patriarch of the Pilgrims, gets as hard hits as Episcopalians ever gave, or would desire to give him. I possess an *editio princeps* of this rare volume, spattered all over with the pen of some Old Mortality of a Covenanter, who wanted to give every sentence double and treble emphasis, after Dr. Beman's new figure in rhetoric, "the impassioned hyperbole." And as to the Puritans, *generally*, when they speak as a body in their Preface to their Confession of Faith of A. D. 1680, they solemnly declare, that it was not matters of *doctrine*, "but what concerns *worship* and *discipline*, that caused our fathers to come into this wilderness." And following in their wake, Dr. Beman himself, the moment he begins to talk of "The Structure of the Primitive Church," dogmatically pronounces it Presbyterian *or* Congregational; though, not very sharp-sighted about such matters, he does not seem to know which. Calvin would have called him a Nicodemian, i. e., a half and half sort of a disciple. (*Dyer's Calvin*, pp. 31, 32.) However, take which side of the fence he may, he implies, (as he is perfectly free to imply, and to assert too, in any sort of exaggeration which will relieve atrabiliousness,) that Episcopacy is a most unapostolic corruption.

* "The heavenly-minded Rutherford," says Hetherington, in his history of the Church of Scotland.—ii. 21.

And all denominations do the same thing; only in linguistic, and other small courtesies, they do not copy Dr. Beman's *strike-ing* example. The Baptist would fain have us believe, that all the Apostles were Baptists—the Methodist, that they were Methodists—and the Quaker, that they were Quakers. Even the Unitarians were once smitten with the common proclivity, and in the person of Dr. Priestley, struggled most lustily to prove the Fathers, every one of them, a Unitarian. An essay for which he was punished most signally by Bp. Horsley, and that too in the estimation of Mr. Gibbon:—no mean critic about an historical question, when he cared not a groat for the opinions of either combatant. (*Gibbon's Autobiography. Eng. ed. pp. 254, 255.*) And in the same spirit, the Romanist used to cry out for “the unanimous consent of the Fathers,” on *his* side of the question. But the Newmanite doctrine of developement has relieved him of the troublesome appeal; and rendered such books as Milner's End of Controversy, and Machale's Evidences and Doctrines, works of supererogation! When I first became acquainted with the theory of developement, it belonged to the Socinians. Many a time have I known them argue, when I lived in New England, that the germ of primitive truth was the simple molecule, the uncompounded Divine Unity, which was gradually developed into the various phases of Trinitarian expansion. The hint was caught up by Mr. Newman, and others; and now, forsooth, we find it quietly conceded, that the Fathers did not teach *modern* Popery, but only the germs of it, which have since been unfolded into their full-blown magnitude. For example, our Savior said to his mother, “Woman, what is it to me and to thee?” (*Douay Bible, John, ii. 4.*) Such language, even the great Jesuit commentator Maldonatus could admit it in 1582, has clearly the appearance of reprehension. But, *now*, we must so reverence her dignity as to believe her, not apparently, but really, as immaculate as Christ Jesus himself! The next step, no doubt, will be, to erect her into a redemptress.

NOTE C.

The word “Sects.”

Great offence seems to have been taken from my employment of this word, and very unnecessarily. It was a word once applied to Christianity itself, and in St. Paul's personal presence, (Acts xxviii. 22,) without disturbing the apostle's equanimity; and I can assure Dr. Beman that, if it will allay any of his perturbations to apply the epithet to *my* church, I will endeavor to imitate apostolic example and not grow queasy and churlish.

To my recollections of boyhood, this new mania of some for the word

“Church” is singularly amusing. Why, I can easily recollect the time, when to call an un-episcopal house of worship *a church*, would give mortal offence. I have actually heard a solemn debate, held at a public assembly of a large religious society, to determine whether the building in which they were gathered together should be called a meeting-house, or a church. After a long and piquant debate, “church” finally carried it by a small majority! This occurred in what geologists would style the transition period. It would have been exceedingly well if the matter had stopped there. But, unfortunately, grave doctrines were caught in the whirl, and experienced changes too. Creeds and confessions were evacuated of their old-fashioned meanings; the Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Trinity, the Atonement, Original Sin and Final Judgment, were suffered to become ante-dated as well as meeting-houses; and if the Episcopal church has sent a few scores to Rome, the Anti-Episcopal church has sent to heresy as many thousands!

In a sermon published so late as 1851, Dr. Beman exclaims, oracularly, in view of the *few scores* alluded to, “There must be some deep-seated and latent cause, for these frequent defections.” What is the deep-seated and latent cause which has sent so many thousands into Unitarianism, and Universalism, and Perfectionism, &c., &c., from the very summits of Congregationalism, and under the droppings of New-School Presbyterian sanctuaries?

NOTE D.

Schism.

The public are particularly requested to observe, that I have nowhere undertaken to define schism formally, still less to bandy it “pugilistically.” I endeavored to be as modest and inoffensive as most writers; and, in my own opinion, much more so, than such high-church Presbyterians as Case, and Gillespie, and Baillie, and Rutherford, and Thomas Edwards, stars of the first magnitude in the firmament of ancient Presbyterian glory. The writings of all these men are upon my book-shelves, and I am not drawing upon my fancy for my conclusion.

I am not certain, however, if I try to let others off as easily as I can, that I can excuse Dr. Beman himself from schismatic delinquency. He vauntingly says, “From whom have we separated and broken unity? Surely not from the established Church of England, nor from that voluntary church organization, called Episcopal, in this country. We — ‘the various sects’ — never belonged to either.” Softly, doctor, softly, with such tones and attitudes of defiance. What purpose soever they may serve for others, they are most unfitting and derogatory to *you*. *You* have broken the unity of the church of your nativity, by your own un-

asked demonstration. *You* have separated yourself from both the churches named, (considering them as mother and daughter) separated yourself widely, and lifted up your heel against them; and are this moment wielding perverted abilities to do them wrong. "It is said that those who have committed" schism "always seem to see" schism-spots "everywhere, and are perpetually brushing their clothes and washing their hands, to remove the unseemly and admonitory stains." Such is Dr. Beman's own language, very slightly modified, for self-adaptation. He flung it at Episcopalians in connexion with murder: he may take it back, as applicable to murder of the church's peace. He represents us as haunted with the spectres of schism and heresy, like a restless assassin. Our answer is, that *he* writes like a man dissatisfied with his ecclesiastical whereabouts, "seeking rest and finding none." He cannot so much as tell whether, *in foro conscientiae*, he ought to be a Presbyterian or a Congregationalist; though the differences of the two split Presbyterianism in twain in England, and have dichotomized it, a second time, on the soil where he was born. "Expediency," he says, and of course expediency with a silver clink in it, might make him either. It looks as though he was inwardly conscious of standing in a false position, *up* to which he is trying to write himself, *into* which he is trying to fight himself. "A man who has written a book," he says, "must try to make his positions good." Another of his apothegms: which I return to him with the following "improved version" — A man who has made an advance backwards, must try to face his accusers, if he cannot his own conscience. Ah, if such a man would return to "his first love," he would enjoy more peace in a day, than controversy will ever gain him, if he could waste the life of an antediluvian in its bitter embroilments. I cannot believe he will ever find a simpler, or sounder, or more excellent creed, than the very Catechism of Episcopacy can afford him; for, though myself not educated formally among Episcopalians, I *was* educated upon that Catechism, and that Catechism alone; and never yet have I found a better summary of "the first principles of the oracles of God." I was always accustomed, from childhood, to see the Bible and the Prayer Book in the hands and the closet of the dearest of relatives; and the very memory of the association is precious. I cannot believe that Dr. Beman has made himself wiser, happier, or more holy, by tearing these volumes asunder.

However, I am not anxious to persist in this strain. I am not anxious to call any man a schismatic, whoever he may be, though the most factious man in the community. Least of all am I anxious to call any man a schismatic, who has so been educated, that, humanly speaking, he can hardly escape a departure from what I believe to have been the platform of the Church Catholic, when there were no schisms at all — no schisms,

i. e., which sundered the body, notwithstanding some trifling ones may have scratched it and made it bleed.

But if convictions resting upon my conscience, and submitted to in the fear of Almighty God over the pages of his own Revealed Word, *do* require (I am willing to say *force*) me to speak of the ecclesiastical state, or the theological opinions, of even *such* a man, as schismatical — who, if I have charity and pity for the man himself, who can equitably call me exclusive? Nay, if I thus obey my conscientious interpretation of the Bible in doing so, who shall dare call me exclusive, and then, in the next moment, almost the next breath, coolly turn round and tell me, I am bound to interpret the Bible according to my conscience, and to follow out its deductions, irrespective of consequences, as the voice of God to my soul? * It is idle, it is inconsistent, it is contradictory, it is absurd, it is impudent, for private-judgment men to tell me to follow my conscience, implicitly, as enlightened by God's Word — except, and except, and except, when I reach conclusions not grateful to themselves! If I could only match Dr. Beman's careering flights in rhetoric, I should say, that this was "the magnificence of nonsensical sublimity," not at the zenith but the nadir of unreason!

I mentioned as a standard of reference, for settling the question of schism, the platform of the Church Catholic, when there were no serious schisms, meaning the platform of the Church in the Nicene Age; because I suppose that to be the first period when the Church Catholic defined her position, *as* the Church Catholic, and, of course, the first possible opportunity presented, since the days of the Apostles, of knowing *how*, (that is in *what* grand, catholic particulars,) this Church considered herself one; and was, how broad soever in her expansion, "builded as a city that is compact together." (Ps. 122. 3) Most willingly would I go to "the Bible and the Bible alone" as a standard in this matter, if our neighbors would but accept *my* most conscientious interpretation, as its legitimate meaning. But that they will forthwith, and unconditionally, reject. And, quite probably, returning the compliment, I should treat their interpretation of it in a similar way. They would persist in reading the Bible *one way* while I should persist in reading it *another way*, and we should simply exchange flat-footed contradictions. They would say *Nay* where I said *Yea*; and they *Yea* where I said *Nay*; and the process would be intermina-

* Because Luther said, at the Diet of Worms, "It cannot be right for a Christian to speak against his conscience," Dr. Beman, in one of his printed publications, has exalted him even to Heaven. If he had only remembered what an awful high-churchman Luther was, in some respects, I am afraid he would have sent him in the contrary direction.

ble and hopeless. And this, too, about fundamental matters of Doctrine, as well as about fundamental matters of Discipline; for it is just as easy to find a man who will deny that the Bible teaches the Trinity, the Atonement, or its own inspiration, as it is to find one who will deny that it teaches Episcopacy, Infant Baptism, or any water-baptism whatever.

Well, then, when "the Bible and the Bible alone" cannot harmonize us, is there anything to which we can appeal as a help, or a guide, to reconcile us about its teachings? anything to which we can resort, that may enable us to look at it from the same stand-point, and draw from it the same conclusions? For such a help, or guide, could we try right reason? or, inward light? or, moral consciousness? or, the nature of things? or whatever the rationalist, or transcendentalist, may please to cognominate as their standard? Right reason, which probably embraces the whole ground, Hobbes of Malmsbury, maintained to be a law of human nature, which is born with us; and, hence, would take it as a natural and infallible appeal, till he saw it led to inevitable collisions.* Lord Brooke, the famous antagonist of Episcopacy, who was killed so singularly by a shot from the Cathedral in Litchfield in 1643, quite agreed with the standard which Hobbes set up and clung to, till somebody's else right reason was at war with his own, when he wanted the authority of the magistrate to silence the vile rebel. Right reason was Lord Brooke's appeal for things indifferent, and virtually for any thing; since he said that himself, (that is, *his* construction of the Scripture,) was to be pre-eminent. The Church was not to judge what was indifferent or otherwise; but *his conscience* was to override any thing the Church might say, and of course any body within it, and if any body *within* it, why, a fortiori, any body *without* it; that is, the whole round world. This is Lord Brooke, *contra mundum*; just as Luther arrayed himself against the Pope, and the Emperor, and hundreds of similar magnates. I do not say that Lord Brooke, or Luther were wrong. God forbid! But I do say, that Lord Brooke's conscience, or Master Luther's conscience, or Dr. Beman's conscience, is not to settle for an Episcopalian, whom he shall call a schismatic; and that if an Episcopalian's conscience requires him to call Doctor Beman a schismatic, that he must submit to his own doctrine about the supremacy of conscientious decisions, and not sneer at them, or denounce them, when they happen to pinch his own case with too close a gripe.

But Lord Brooke tried to play the amiable, for he said, "I love to deal plainly." So he condescends to define; and, when the question is put to him, "But who shall tell us, what is *Recta Ratio*," what will my readers

* Cumberland's Laws of Nature, pp. 96, 97.

suppose was his answer? An elaborate one, certainly; for he received, says a biographer, such an education as became the great estate and dignity to which he succeeded in his twentieth year. And now, will it be believed, that this great mind, which was keen enough to detect the base coin of Episcopacy, while hundreds of his fellow-aristocrats were utterly blind about it, had no answer to give to this probing enquiry, but that *recta ratio* is to tell us what is *recta ratio*? Yet, it was even and verily so. Such child's play as that, is enough to set at naught a whole ecclesiastical establishment, or pull it down about the ears of its abettors, with the gigantic strength of Samson demolishing the temple of the Philistines!! Credat Judæus Apella, aut Beman.*

Well, if right reason, and the nature of things, &c., can help us no better, what shall we next resort to, for umpirage? Shall we try an appeal to Heaven by prayer? God forbid, again, that I should ever discourage any thing so blessed and sacred. But when prayer is applied to for the purpose of settling our own creed, against the creed of an adversary, it becomes a two-edged sword; and can be misused and misappropriated just like the Bible itself. Every one insists that the Bible has but one sense, and *that* the sense which he himself chooses to put on it. So every one would interpret his prayers in the sense, in which he wanted an answer, the sense of his own predilections. The final result would be, that we should *all* alike be mistrusted, as Lord Herbert was; who wrote a book upon religion, which *he* thought a right one, though thousands thought it a wrong one, and who solemnly declared that he submitted the question of its publishment to the Almighty, and was answered by an audible voice!

Well, then, if the Bible, if right reason and the nature of things, if prayer, (not one nor all) can bring us to a common basis, for mutual good understanding, is the case desperate? Shall it be abandoned as incurable, or shall we try—make at least an endeavor, even if not successful—to settle upon some standard of appeal for fixing and bounding the Bible's signification, by which there is a possibility, even if a faint one, that we may be brought into harmony? It seems to me worth while to make another effort, for a discovery of the standard in question, and in prosecuting such an effort, I know no better guide than a reference to the first opportunity which the Church Catholic (“the Holy Church throughout all the world”) took to speak by a catholic or universal voice. That period was the period of the Council of Nice, A. D. 325. The Church was then

* “But who shall tell us what is *Recta Ratio*. I answer, *Recta Ratio*.”—Lord Brooke’s “Discourse, opening the nature of that Episcopacy, which is exercised in England. London, 1641.” p. 14.

at one, indeed we may say entirely at one, a complete unity; for a few heretics even no more sundered that unity than a Hymeneus or Philetus destroyed the unity, which bound the Church of Ephesus to the great society of the faithful. (II. Tim. ii. 17.)

So the Church was then one, confessedly one, altogether one, fully one. She was, in her comprehension, catholic; but, in her consolidation, a Communion of Saints. She was a grand whole, with easy intercommunication between all its parts; and thus she was, *ad literam*, what the Creed describes her as being—a Holy Catholic Church, and *also* a Communion of Saints.*

Well, and in what great features was the whole Church then one Church, and one Communion? one in all its extent, and one in the bonds which tied its parts together? Why, for one such feature, in the doctrine of the Trinity, as the Nicene Creed evinces. There is no dispute about this, even among candid Socinians. And, so striking was then the harmony about this doctrine, that even our Presbyterian friends have been accustomed to argue, that it is idle to suppose that the whole Church, (not a section of it, but all Christendom collectively,) could have been mistaken about the transmission of such a doctrine from apostolic times. If precedents have any authority, the whole history of judicial decisions in the Roman and British Empires could not furnish such an example. No lawyer could make out a clearer or stronger case, by the Civil Law of the one, or the Common Law of the other. No Christian need hesitate to say, that the case amounts to a moral demonstration; for if it does not, the *whole* Church has erred in a fundamental of faith, the promise of Christ to her has proved untrue, and the gates of hell have not only fought against her, but have prevailed.

We accord with them here, most heartily. But we go a step further, and say, if the whole Church, all Christendom collectively, “the Holy

* The hint of a friend seems to make it advisable for me to explain, here, that I take the phrase “Communion of Saints,” as describing a peculiarity of the Church in this world, and as having no relation to the Church in the world to come. I interpret the phrase *historically*, and not *dogmatically*; as I have long been accustomed to do, with terms and phrases common in Church History. It was not in the Creed originally; but was introduced, after attempts to split the Church into schisms or separations, taught the plain necessity of exhibiting the Church, not as one great whole simply, but a whole having connexion or communion, (i. e. proper inter-communication,) among and between, all its various parts. The phrase, “Holy Catholic Church,” describes the Church, so to speak, by its circumference. The phrase, “Communion of Saints,” describes it, in its centralization. The one makes us think of a body, the other of the joints and sinews which keep the body together, and render it manageable. See *King on the Creed edit. 1719, pp. 314, 342*. King says the phrase dates from St. Augustine’s times; and was introduced in consequence of the Donatist Schism. So, being levelled originally at schism on earth, it must be interpreted accordingly.

Church throughout all the world," could not then have been mistaken about a fundamental in doctrine, neither could it have been mistaken about a fundamental in discipline. Now if the Christian Church was then a Trinitarian Church, much more was it an Episcopal Church; *for there was not then a Christian upon earth who was not an Episcopalian*.* Even the heretics, who questioned the Church's doctrine, did not dream of questioning the Church's discipline as Episcopal. This was so incontestably apostolic, that the first men (*save one*) the very first men, who thought seriously of dispensing with it, were the continental Reformers of the sixteenth century. For this I appeal to Mr. Gibbon, as acute an observer as any body, and as impartial a testifier, since he did not care a groat for any church. Mr. Gibbon even admits that Episcopacy was introduced into Asia, in the life-time of St. John, and is recognized in one of his *inspired* compositions. He only doubts about its introduction into Corinth and Rome, during the first century, because an *uninspired* authority does not warrant the fact to him. But leaving this portion of time, with such a

* There was no Pope, then, either—at least, no Pope of Rome, by way of eminence. The word pope was then as harmless as the Latin, and the English too for it, (*papa*) now is. Thus, Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, is called Pope, and most glorious and blessed Pope; and that too by the clergy of Rome itself!—*Lib. of the Fathers*, xvii. pp. 62, 68, 74, 79.

Though it is a hint which might be worked up into an essay, I can only observe briefly in a note, that the simple-hearted ignorance of the Nicene Church about Popery, and its perfect acquiescence in Diocesan Episcopacy, stand out in most striking light when brought into parallel with the distractions and debates of the Ante-Nicene Church, respecting the subordinate, the very subordinate question, about the proper observance of Easter-Day. This question was a troublesome one, back to the time of Polycarp, the angel or bishop of the Church of Smyrna—say A.D. 150. It was never settled, satisfactorily, till the Nicene Council, A.D. 325. In view of the agitations produced by the Easter question, it will never answer to say (what is so often said) that Popery or Prelacy crept in upon the Church, stealthily or quietly. These agitations prove, demonstrably, that, if the early Church had been a spiritual despotism, with an emperor at its head; or had adopted the Presbyterian platform, of entire ministerial imparity; or the Congregational platform, where the vote of the people constitutes the essence of ordination;—that convulsions, and strifes, and controversies, must have shaken the Church, as with the blasts of a tornado, before it would have been contented, *to a man*, with an Episcopacy, which, while it was an independent Episcopacy, was, nevertheless, incontestably Diocesan. Yet, we never hear of the slightest disturbances, or even differences, in the Ante-Nicene Church, about the great subject of Church-government. And the Church, in A.D. 325, settles down as quietly, upon a moderate Diocesan Episcopacy, as if it had never heard of anything else, or dreamed of it. The plain conclusion of course is, that it had never entered into its heart to conceive of anything else of the kind. It would have given a loud *Amen* to what Chillingworth, a name almost hallowed among non-episcopal Protestants, said more than a thousand years afterwards, "When I shall see, therefore, all the fables in the Metamorphosis acted and prove histories; when I shall see all the democracies and aristocracies in the world lie down and sleep, and awake into monarchies; then will I begin to believe that Presbyteriall government, having continued in the Church during the Apostles' times, should presently after, against the Apostles' doctrine and will of Christ, be whirled about like a scene in a masque, and transformed into Episcopacy."

doubt hanging over it as would be, at least *ought* to be, no doubt to a Christian believer, he comes freely and unhesitatingly to this broad and comprehensive conclusion: "After we have passed the difficulties of the first century, we find the Episcopal government *universally* established, till it was interrupted by the republican genius of the Swiss and German Reformers." (*Dec. & Full, chap. xv. notes, 110, 112.*) I beg particular attention to the word republican; for in it Mr. Gibbon has touched the core of the case, and intimated a most undoubted truth, that these Reformers would never have opposed, but rather rejoiced in, such a simple republican Episcopacy as exists in these United States, where a bishop is a dignitary much inferior to the Governor of a commonwealth, and has often less of influence than the President of a College. They would not have opposed even the aristocratic Episcopacy of England, where an archbishop is a duke, and a bishop a baron. This statement, Calvin will soon bear me out in; but what I wish now to say is, that these Reformers did not oppose Episcopacy, *per se*, or as unprimitive or unscriptural, (the character of the opposition which now assails it;) but rather the Episcopacy of Rome. They would not endure a colossal and irresponsible episcopal despotism, in which bishops should be viceroys, and the pope an Emperor — in which, the domain was the terraqueous globe, and the jurisdiction covered the property, opinions, and life, of any and every human being.*

Such an Episcopacy England herself would not tolerate. She began her opposition to it in Gregory's own person; and, through the instrumentality of William the Conqueror, commenced the work which his successors completed. (*Giesler, iv. pp. 25-27.*) But that is not my subject now; which is to show, that Calvin himself was so far from being an enemy to a Republican Episcopacy, that he was ready to shower curses upon the heads of its ill-starred opponents. Heaven be thanked that human curses are not immortal; or some heads in *our* neighborhood, would be in doleful peril from Calvinic execrations! And, further, that he was also a tolerator of an aristocratic Episcopacy, and made the proper distinction between even *that*, and the Episcopacy of Rome. The summary which Mr. Long has made of his sentiments on these points, by quotations from his own treatises, shall now speak for me.

"My judgment is, that if we may have such an hierarchy [it is his very word, for the Latin is *hierarchiam*] in which the Bishops so excel others, that they refuse not subjection to Christ, but would depend on him as their

* Compare the Dictates of Gregory, which are so abominable, that a moderate Romanist, like Du Pin, is anxious to disavow them. (*Epit. Ch. Hist. iii. 108.—*) Giesler shows they are *virtually*, if not *technically*, Gregory's. (*Ch. Hist. iv. pp. 5, 6, Eng. edit.*)

only head, and refer themselves to him; in which they so preserve brotherly communion among themselves, that they are united by nothing more than his truth in this case; I denounce him worthy of all curses, who doth not observe such an hierarchy, with all reverence and obedience.— And I would to God, such a succession had continuance to this day, it should easily have found from us, the obedience that it deserves. I do account the government by Archbishops, a moderate honor, as being within the compass of a man's power to execute, which the Pope's pretended authority is not." (*Calvinus Redivivus*, p. 27.) As an echo to this I will but add the suffrage of Beza, Calvin's successor. "If there be any, as I think there is not, who altogether reject the Episcopal Order, God forbid that any of sound brains should ever assent to their furies." This last quotation comes from a little book, issued by the gentle and amiable Bp. Morton in 1644, with the design of throwing a little oil upon the waters, during the formidable contests of the seventeenth century in England. It came out in the very heat of the contest, in 1644; and if anti-episcopalians could have riddled it, not a shred would have remained. It would have been convicted of a hundred such forgeries as I am thought ready to commit upon the original copy of my Lecture, and am accused of beforehand; if not in so many words, yet fully so, as far as intentions can be obliquely communicated. But the pamphlet survived the hottest accusations, and was reprinted in 1662; and it is from this edition I am quoting, and could quote on, *ex abundanti*, if the occasion demanded.*

A multiplicity of such authorities as has been given may not be necessary; and I will but subjoin, that this little book boldly makes, and confirms my position, that the Swiss and German Reformers quarreled not with, but rather gave "their ample suffrages for, our English Episcopacy;" and had no intention, but to "speak against the Romish hierarchy." (p. 6.)

And now to pick up the thread of my foregoing observations. We see that when the Christian World first spoke, *as* the Christian World, the Trinity was all but the universal faith; while we know that it remains so, to the present hour. We see that Episcopacy was, at the same juncture, the absolutely universal discipline, and has never been objected to by the most respectable continental Protestants, except in the shape of an impe-

* "Confessions and proofs of Protestant Divines, of reformed churches, that Episcopacy is, in respect of the *office*, according to the word of God, and in respect of the *use*, the best." Some may be so very curious to know what Luther thought upon this subject, that I add another quotation from the volume. "Luther may well be allowed for the foreman amongst the Reformers of the Protestant Religion; who proveth the Prelacy of Episcopacy *above simple Presbyters*, (for so he saith,) by *Divine Right*; and this he doth in his tractate called his Resolution, grounding his judgment upon Scripture." *Thesis*, iii. p. 7.

rial despotism, as found in the spiritual dynasty of Rome. And in view of such grand and matchless facts, we thus say—Here was a fundamental feature in Christian Doctrine, and also a fundamental feature in Christian Discipline, about which *all* Christendom were once perfectly and harmoniously agreed, and which the most intelligent and reasonable of even non-episcopal Protestants have never objected to; and our simplicity teaches us to believe, that such things, so consented to, are not to be trifled with, not to be treated as “things indifferent;” and that if Christian Unity is ever again to be seen upon earth, now, or hereafter, we must go back to the platform on which the Christian World was, once and verily, an unbroken Communion of Saints. Church Unity on any other platform, than that on which, as fact evinces, *it once stood*, and which Calvin and his contemporaries “would to God had continued to their day,” we do not believe within the circle of things practicable. The old basis, therefore, must be gone back to, the old paths must be travelled backwards to get to it; and then Unity may come a second time, and bless us with her seraphic smile. The Trinity as the basis for Doctrine, and Episcopacy as the basis for Discipline, we believe must lie at the foundation; and as we desire church unity and pray for it, as we desire to imitate and perpetuate the Church as she was, on the first occasion after the Great Council of Jerusalem, (*Acts*, xv.) when she acted as one, we do not feel at liberty to compromise either of these great principles.

And, at the hazard of a little repetition, I will say, that the last men on earth who ought to ask us to compromise them, or to surrender or suppress our opinions about their importance; are they whose favorite dogmas, whose everlasting themes for declamation, are the supremacy of private judgment, and the inviolable sanctity of individual conscience, in the interpretation of God’s Word. In the exercise, and under the protection of these very prerogatives, we interpret God’s Word as teaching, what his own whole Church has once accepted—the Trinity as a fundamental in Doctrine, and Episcopacy as a fundamental in Discipline.* And to say nothing here about the Trinity, if we have the right to pronounce any one a schismatic, who rejects an apostolic Episcopacy, we are certainly as modest and abstinent and unprovoking, as may be, in the exercise of such a right. We utter no positive censures whatever, upon any man or body

* I speak here of fundamentals in Discipline, as well as of fundamentals in Doctrine. The former sort of fundamental many would now laugh to scorn. But the old Puritans of New England, much better read *as divines*, than many who ignorantly glorify them, understood this distinction, and acknowledged the double fundamental without hesitation. John Cotton does so, in a sentence too long to quote. *Bloody Tenet*, &c., p. 5. He says the two sorts of fundamentals are mentioned in Heb. vi. 1. 2. *Comp. Sam. Mather’s Apology*, p. 4.—Boston, 1738.

of Christians, for differing from us, *toto caelo*, on this prominent matter. In the preface to the Ordinal, where our Church speaks of ordinations, she solemnly appeals to Scripture and Antiquity* as her authoritative guides in the matter, *for herself*. This is her own language; "And, therefore, to the intent that these Orders [Bishops, Priests, and Deacons] may be continued and reverently used and esteemed *in this Church*, no man shall be accounted, or taken to be, a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, *in this Church*, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called tried and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following; or, hath had Episcopal Consecration or Ordination." In the Prayer Book of our Mother Church, the phrase *Church of England* takes the place of the phrase *this Church*. And, in the same spirit, our very first and foremost ecclesiastical canon runs thus; "*In this Church*, there shall always be three orders in the Ministry, viz., Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." In such manifestos our Church does no worse, nor otherwise, than the late Dr. Milnor himself did—a leading member of that section of the Episcopal Church, to which Dr. Beman condescends to be gracious. This most venerable man, my personal friend, once said to me with his own lips, "If my Presbyterian brethren are satisfied with their ordination, they are entirely welcome to it. For myself, I could not be content with it." This is substantially what our Church, and its mother, say in the Ordinal and canon just quoted. *For themselves*, they cannot accept such ordination; but politely, not scowlingly, beg to be excused. And then, forthwith, cry some of their calumniators, This is exclusive, and illiberal, and intolerant, and unmerciful, and belligerent, and "pugilistic"; because they do not acknowledge *our* ordination also, and submit to such dogmatic definitions of the essentials of an ordination, as *we* think proper.

That is, my neighbor over the way will not be content that I should exercise my family government, in a way which suits myself without his supervision, but unless I will acknowledge *his* family government to be just as good as mine, he will issue a *pronunciamento* against my unsocial bigotry; and that, too, though I let him alone, and allow him to be high, or low, or broad, or, if he prefer, nothingarian. I express my opinions about family government, and the best sort of family government, frankly and freely, and act upon them, without the fear of mortal clay before my eyes. But, alas, I in this way indirectly condemn him! Well, and what if I do? The issue is unavoidable. As Luther said at the Diet of Worms,

* Here, of course, we shall be told, she is awfully wrong: she ought to have taken Scripture alone. But, by Antiquity, she does not mean a witness *independent* of Scripture, but *interpretative* of it. It amounts to this. Our church takes Scripture and Antiquity, instead of Scripture and Dr. Beman.

‘God help me, Amen.’ For as to swallowing down my opinions and altering or disparaging my own rules, to please him, no law of Heaven or earth, that I know of, demands the sacrifice.

Has any man beneath the sun the right to ask Episcopalians to withhold their opinions, or to act inconsistently with those opinions, and then sit coolly down to his desk, and indite the sentiment, that private judgment and one’s own conscience, and not the private judgment or the conscience of one’s neighbor, is the only legitimate rule of action? We think not. We think it very inconsistent, if not intolerant, to do so. And the more do we think thus, because the impugners of Episcopacy never complain loudly of a Presbyterian, for his *close* Atonement, denying it to unelect infants; never of a Baptist for his *close* communion; never of a Methodist, for a *close* class-meeting; never of a Quaker, for a *close* marriage; never of a Socinian, for a *close* rejection of creeds. But the moment a hapless Episcopalian follows out the practice, to which his private judgment and conscience constrain him, of *close* ordination—oh, the welkin rings with changes upon his “envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness.”

And harsher still does such treatment seem to us, when we remember, that we yield all we possibly can. We make occasional communion no obstacle, nor even lay baptism, nor want of a liturgy, though some would fain represent such concessions as gross inconsistencies, and cast them into our teeth; just as Julian threw St. Augustine’s inconsistency back into his face, because he would not believe, out and out, in “the decree of absolute reprobation.” The sturdy polemic had rather make a mistake in his logic, than in his charity, about doubtful matters; and so had we.* We give our half-brethren the benefit of our doubts, *where we can*; and most ungenerous, most unmanly is their conduct, when, like the spiteful heretic above mentioned, they upbraid us with want of self-conformity.

Liturgies, indeed, we hold to be primitive and highly expedient; but by no means insist on them, as indispensable for Church-unity. Liturgies and ceremonies have always been regarded as matters susceptible of change or rejection. We do not look upon these things, as essential to the integrity of an apostolic Episcopacy. We do not believe, indeed, that it would be safe or innocuous to abandon venerable formularies of faith and devotion, thereby endangering doctrinal purity, and scattering and wasting those hallowed emotions, which Presbyterians themselves (so far as relates to psalms, and hymns, and creeds, and catechisms,) are willing to admit can cluster

* Emerson’s Wiggers, p, 248. Neander’s Hist. iv. 384, Eng. Ed.

round and cling to, a “form of sound words,” consecrated by age and the example of saints.*

Of the things, then, about which I have been speaking, this is the sum. The doctrine of the Trinity as propounded in the Nicene Creed (the first, and, as yet, the only grand communion creed of the Church Catholic) with Episcopacy as practised by the compilers† of that Creed — these two fundamentals in Doctrine and Discipline are a basis for a *concordat*, with any Christian, or any body of Christians whatever. This is the substance of the *concordat* which Bp. Griswold, (that pattern of Christian meekness and charity,) instructed our missionaries to offer to the Christians of the East. I once asked the late Bp. Wainwright, if the Trinity, as maintained in the Nicene Creed, and an apostolic Episcopacy, were not sufficient as a basis for Catholic Union, the wide world over. And with that bright-eyed vivacity, with which he ever responded to a proposition he accounted intuitive, he answered, “Certainly.” I think I know enough of my own Church’s teaching and temper, to warrant me in hoping, that our General Convention would answer the same question in a similar way.

I beg, however, to be distinctly understood. I say these two great points are enough as a basis for Catholic Union. I by no means say, they are all we should hold, letting every thing else go as unimportant. I make no such rash admission. I simply say, they are sufficient as a basis for a Catholic Union; or, as some would prefer to call it, an Evangelical Alliance. From these as a basis, the Primitive Church went easily and steadily forward, and in other great Councils than the Nicene, provided for exigencies as they arose; and could have gone on providing for any and every exigency, had she not been made to pause, and go along halting and crippled, by schism — the severance of the East from the West, and the severance of the West within itself — all precipitated by Romish usurpations, which the Catholic World has never submitted to, and the promulgation of a creed (Pope Pius’s) which the Catholic World has never accepted. So long as the old Nicene basis was the *point d’appuis* (as the French say) the great Councils were accepted every where, and answered every purpose, without Papal decrees upon the one hand, or theories of inspiration and dogmatic systems upon the other. The Church of England has always respected the few *such* Councils as

* Compare Dr. Cumming’s Preface to John Knox’s Prayer Book.

† I say compilers, and not framers; for the Council did not manufacture the faith, as they would a canon law. They simply verified and attested the faith, as handed down to themselves, and to be passed on unaltered. The Creed, therefore, comes to us, not as *an opinion* (the too common view taken of it,) but as *a witness*. As a witness, its testimony is irresistible.

history supplies to us.* The Oriental Christians have always respected *such* councils.† The Swiss Reformers respected *such* councils with characteristic vigor: they made the polemical Creed, (the Athanasian,) and the Edict of Theodosius about the Trinity, tests of doubtful orthodoxy.‡ The Westminster Assembly respected *such* councils, condemning a book as heretical, because it did “cautelously decline the orthodox expressions of the Ancient Church, in the foure first generall Synods.” (*Cheyne on the Trinity*, p. 455.) The ancient Baptists respected *such* councils; for this is the remarkable testimony of Thomas Grantham, one of the Baptist Fathers. “This Confession of Faith [the Nicene Creed] as it is of great antiquity, so, verily, were it diligently considered, might be a good means to bring to a greater degree of unity, many of the divided parties professing Christianity.” Amen, Thomas Grantham, Amen. (*See Christianismus Primitivus*, by T. G., London, 1678. Book ii. p. 61.) And even the New England Puritans were once wise enough to applaud *such* councils, for their expositions of *doctrine*. “How signally the Lord hath owned the confession of the four General Synods or Councils, for the suppression of the heresies of those times, needs not to be said; since no man can be ignorant thereof, that hath made it his concern to be acquainted with things of this nature;” *i. e.* as we Churchman would phrase it, no man “diligently reading Holy Scripture and Ancient Authors.”§ So it seems the infallible Head of the Church, and not fallible man, owned these Councils in their voice about fundamentals in *doctrine*. Did the same infallible approbation *disown* them in their voice about a fundamental in discipline; (Episcopacy;) though, in that respect, their voice was stronger and more unanimous, *than on any thing beside?* No, say Calvin and Lu-

* Grier's Epitome of the Councils; App'x. Jebb's Sermons; App'x.

† Blackmore's Doct. of the Russian ch. p. 45, Cyrilli Lucaris Confessio, Censura, &c, p. 131, Geneva, 1645. Smith on the Greek ch. p. 217. So the Armenians. Rycant on the Greek and Armenian Churches, p. 409. Even the Abyssinians come almost up to the Puritans, and acknowledge *three* Ludolphs Ethiopia, Sec. Ed. p. 272. Mr. Neale labors hard to excuse the Armenians for stopping there. “The troubles of the times prevented the Armenians from taking any part in the fourth Eucumenical Council.”—Hist. Eastern ch. Gen. Introd. p. 1080. See on the whole subject of the Greek Church, a most interesting little book by Edward Masson, Esq., an Englishman, a Presbyterian and an intelligent jurist, who had “been for twenty years in intimate intercourse with Greeks of all classes.” The book is worth its weight in gold, for a single sentence. “There are few things Rome would more dread, than an intimate connexion between the Greek and Anglican Churches,” p. 90, London Edit. of 1844.

‡ Dyer's Calvin, p. 448. The Edict of Theodosius thus endorses the first four General Councils “Nam sequimur, *in omnibus*, sancta quatuor concilia, et quae ab unoquoque eorum constituta sunt.”—*Kriegel's Corpus Juris Civilis. Codex I. 1, or p. 11.*

§ Cambridge Platform, p. 72, Boston, 1829.

ther and their contemporaries; for we resisted not a republican, but an imperial Episcopacy. Yes, however, says the Puritan, and his sympathizers, (who resist *all* Episcopacy as unscriptural and anti-christian) yes, the Lord did as verily disown them there, as he elsewhere sustained them. Oh, why could they not have been a trifle more consistent, and have believed their Lord less partial? For, if they had done justice (I will not say to their Lord) but to actual common sense, Protestantism would now have presented an unbroken front to Romanism, and the taunt which has been, still is, and is to be, rung in our ears, about our self-condemning variations, have been forever unheard. Protestant unanimity seems now altogether impossible. Its variations are multiplying, and not diminishing. To whom is this melancholy result to be attributed? to those who follow the Primitive Church *half-way*; or to those who would follow it, not in doctrine only, but in discipline too? We are not afraid of the answer of the unprejudiced and the candid, to such a question as this.

We hold up, then, in all conscientiousness, and in all confidence, too, the platform of the Church in the Nicene Age, as the only real and practicable basis for Catholic Union, or Evangelical Alliance, and for the termination of schism. The Holy and undivided Trinity, and Diocesan Episcopacy in its republican simplicity, are our motto for the attainment of this glorious consummation. This Trinity, nearly all Christendom still receives, with reverence and affection. Eleven-twelfths of all Christendom still receive this Episcopacy, in a greater or less degree of purity. And even now, on so blessed and auspicious a basis, but for the Pope on the one side, and some of our Protestant brethren upon the other, departed days might return again, and the Holy Catholic Church become, as in the Nicene age, a Communion of Saints. But the Pope will never acknowledge a Diocesan Episcopacy, which has genuine, republican, independence; while some of our Protestant brethren will acknowledge no Episcopacy at all; and, in these circumstances, harmony can only be an ideality and a hope, and the Communion of Saints remain but a sacred phrase in the Creed, and the most sorrowful of them all to a sensitive heart in its daily professions.

It is idle, to bring in here the last argument with which we are confronted, when we offer a *definite and tangible* basis for union, and press us with the *indefinite and intangible* subject of unanimity of feeling, as a sufficient catholicon for breaches of concord. My note is already very long, and I might be permitted to pass such an argument by; but, for charity's sake, I am willing to consider it freely, and so go on.

Dr. Beman is not so well read in Scripture, as he believes himself, when he puts forward this argument, and refers for his authority to the fourth

chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians. The Unity of the Spirit alluded to in the third verse, is not what he, and many careless readers suppose: i. e., unity in good feeling, or, unity in mere affection. The word Spirit, there used, is printed with a capital letter; as even the revised Bible of the American Bible Society might have taught him.* It is not man's spirit, but God's Spirit, which is there spoken of, i. e. the Holy Ghost.† Now *his* unity is a unity *through*, and *in*, and *upon* the Truth; for he is called, over and over again in the Bible, the Spirit of Truth; and his name is here put, by a simple metonymy, for the System of Truth which he has revealed by inspiration. Its parallel is given in the thirteenth verse, "*the unity of the faith*;" not unity of faith as a virtue of the life, but of *the* faith, meaning the great system of christian faith or belief. The English translation is here fortunate enough to bring out the force of the Greek articles fully. Now unity in respect to such a system, (a system which is objective, or external to ourselves,) must be founded on a consent about, at least, the chief component parts which make it up. And I have yet to learn that the visible church, which is "the pillar and ground of the truth," the foundation and columns which hold up the grand edifice of the whole Christian System, is not one of the parts of it, and a pretty important one too.‡ But I will not dwell upon this point; and will but add, that it is a single illustration, among a hundred, to show how easy it is for different minds to read Scripture differently, and that if we will not accept Scripture, as interpreted and acted on by the Primitive Church, we shall simply go on contradicting each other for ever, and ending where we began.

But granting, for argument's sake, that unity of the spirit is unity between human spirits in the mere point of feeling or affection, or mutual pacific toleration, let us see what it comes to. Then, the essence of Christianity, the true union among its disciples, is, as the old Familists used to say, and as the Come-Outers now say, not unanimity in belief, but unanimity in emotion. Then, Christianity becomes, as these people tell us, *a life*, and not *a belief*; and authorizes any sort of opinions y'clepd Christian, provided the entertainers of such opinions live together peaceably,

* I have used this a good deal, and am happy to acknowledge its improvements and accuracy, so far as they have come under my eye.

† When unity between human spirits is spoken of, the word *spirit* is printed, as in the prayer, for all sorts and conditions of men, without an article before *unity*, and without an article and a capital to the word *spirit*. Thus, "in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace," &c. See the Standard Edition of the Prayer Book.

‡ I Tim, iii. 15. I am rejoiced to find the Am. Bible Society sustaining the old punctuation of this text. A well-known German one makes the close of the verse terribly back-handed.

and acknowledge one another for brethren. But if unity, upon such a basis as this, is sufficient, then all sorts and conditions of men, professing and calling themselves Christians, may claim a share in it, and one, quite as large a share and as good a share as another. Then the Swedenborgian and the Socinian, the Hicksite and the Shaker, the Universalist and the Chrystian, the Perfectionist and the Spiritualist, the Campbellite and the Mennonite, the Millerite and the Wakemanite, the Dunker, the Tunker, and the Jumper, the Mormonite, aye and even the Roman Catholic, if he will, can claim a part in such unity, and the dignity of its honors, as well as, and as much as, Dr. Beman himself. Such unity, probably, would be a little too promiscuous, and would have to be narrowed down by a creed. But what creed? any creed that Dr. Beman should choose to propound, on his individual infallibility? Ah, that would smack so loudly of the Vatican as to require a Roman Obedience for its scope. What creed then? Why the Bible, and that alone: this is the religion of *all* Protestants.

"The Bible and that alone," exclaim the Swedenborgian, and the Socinian, &c., &c., &c., why, that is our creed already! We receive the Bible as well as Dr. Beman, and we profess and call ourselves Christians, *as we understand it*. We exercise the glorious right of private judgment, and the inviolability of conscience, which he so vociferously applauded in the case of Martin Luther, and they make us what we proclaim ourselves to be.* Now will Dr. Beman [for Old-School Presbyterians are pretty stiff creed-men, and would not be apt to put their toes in such a trap,] follow out his doctrine about unity in spirit, without unanimity in the faith? If so, let him acknowledge us, one and all, (not by any manner of means leaving out the Roman Catholic,) just as good Christians as himself, and, *then*, on our part, we will do him the compliment of being somewhat condescending also, and return his politeness, by saying he is a consistent doctrinarian.

Would Dr. Beman listen to such a pathetic application and, like Calvin, accept a *bonne bouche* of flattery, even if it comes from heretical and fanatic lips? Or, will he cast about for some distinguishing creed, or platform, *not his own*? If he will do such a thing as that, to avoid "falling into a place where two seas meet," why can he not flee for refuge to the old plank on which the Church once outrode the storms, which threatened to break her into fragments? He will find that, where we Episcopalians have found it,

* Precisely so, did ancient heretics. They held that every man had a right to interpret Scripture for himself, and to depart from any established notions, as he thought proper; "*arbitrio suo fidem innovare*," as Tertullian expressed it. *De Praescrip, Haeret* § 42. Hence they claimed that they were as good Christians as anybody. They exercised no right but that of private judgment!

in the Bible, with the Primitive Church as our pilot, amid "doubtful disputations" over its sacred pages. If he can find, devise, or even invent, a better or a surer one, let him give us his illumination forthwith. If he can propose a more tried basis for Church Unity, and the prevention of schism, a more promising *henoticon*,* in God's name let us have it without delay.† But this is inevitable: if private judgment and individual conscience are the only standard of appeal, to settle the Bible's meaning, then, *on that basis*, every man is at liberty to make out his own Bible, and his own Church, to his own liking; or — or — there must be some other criterion for the settlement of difficulties, and bringing the endless successions of schism to a tranquil close. This criterion, as the Romanist maintains, is the Pope; or rather, the Pope's private judgment and individual conscience — since the Romanist does not all avoid the private judgment and individual conscience system.‡ He is the most enormous believer in such a system, with which I am acquainted; he has but one such judgment, and one such conscience for every human being beneath the sun. From such a criterion, the Romanist's next neighbor flies off with detestation, and exclaims, "No, No, I am my own pope. I interpret the Bible for myself. My own mind is my own supreme court, for such a book's elucidation. I have a complete and indefeasible right to such a privilege, and I insist that Dr. Beman, and every other doctor, who teaches the complete supremacy of private judgment and individual conscience, shall receive and allow my

* An *henoticon* is the name of a formula for concord, rendered famous in the Church, from its connexion with the name of the Emperor Zeno.—*Murdock's Mosheim*, I. 436.

† The never-failing answer which we get to this appeal is, 'Go to the Bible.' This is the answer which Archibald Henderson gave at the famous conference, between himself and Charles I. at Newcastle, in 1646. Charles, fortunately, had been bred a theologian, as he never expected to be a king; and he told Mr. Henderson that the meaning of the Bible was *the very matter in dispute*, and that while one said Aye, and the other No, the dispute must be interminable. He, accordingly, pressed Mr. Henderson for some umpire, which could determine a dispute, when one read his Bible one way, and the other another way, both utterly disagreeing over precisely the same texts. He pressed him to the last, without avail. "My conclusion," said Charles, "is, that albeit I never esteemed any authority equal to the Scriptures; yet I do think the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and the universal practice of the Primitive Church, to be the best and most authenthical interpreters of God's Word, and, consequently, the fittest judges between me and you, when we differ, *until you shall find me better*."—(Aiton's Henderson, p. 660.) Mr. Henderson did not, or could not reply; for he knew that if he admitted the appeal, Episcopacy would follow, inevitably. He was silent, and soon after went home, took to his bed, and died. The proposition for something better to settle differences over the Bible, still remains unanswered, after two hundred years' waiting.

‡ The Jesuits think so, as well as myself; for this is the dictum of one of the most celebrated of the order. "The Pope, I grant, has said this as Head of the Church; but, in doing so, he only gives a greater extension to the sphere of probability of his opinion."—*Pascal's Wks.* ii. 81, *Eng. Edit.* 1849.

claim, and welcome me as a fellow-christian, let me interpret the Bible as I may, though it be to bring it into concord with the Book of Mormon."

Will Dr. Beman rule in the plea; or superciliously cast it out? He must allow it; or turn pope himself, and denounce the rebel; or go for refuge to the platform on which the Church once stood, in her comprehension, as Holy and Catholic, and, in her compactness, as knit together, by joints and bands, into one Communion of Saints. He can find such a platform *actually put into working order, and built upon*, in the Nicene Age; and he will in vain search for a better, till he travels backward to that Age, and takes the Bible as the Church then took it. The Church then spoke clearly, definitely, unmistakably, about fundamentals in doctrine and fundamentals in discipline; and was virtually a unit.* He who rejects her Catholic voice, and acts of saintly communion, as expounding Scripture, must do the Pope of Rome homage; or turn his own pope and make his own mind a Vatican; or, he must give heretics and fanatics of all sorts, the right hand of fellowship, and say, 'We all alike receive the Bible, we all interpret it with equal freedom, and upon the same great principles; and, *therefore*, we are all good Christians together.'

NOTE E.

Charity : its true predicate.

I have represented charity as belonging to the heart, rather than the head; and as properly exerted, not upon opinions, but upon individuals. And I have been profoundly astonished at objections to such a statement, from would-be learned divines, as if it were at all a novel doctrine. Why, I supposed it was a doctrine fully recognized, from the days when the question arose in the Church about the legitimacy of persecution for opinion's sake, and when St. Augustine taught his contemporaries, to make a due and a broad distinction between men and the mistakes of men. *Diligit homines, interficite errores*; love the men but absolutely kill their errors, was his language in one of his books against Petilian, the Donatist schismatic, who endeavored to provoke all the envy and rancour and hostility which he could muster, and rally them against the Church. Augus-

* Mr. Isaac Taylor would fain depreciate the Primitive Church, because it had foolish notions, here and there, about virginity. Foolish notions prevailed in the Corinthian Church about such matters in apostolic times, as St. Paul's Epistles show. But what has all this to do with great fundamentals, attested by the Church, in her representative character, in her catholic assemblies? Some of us think one way, and some another, about witchcraft, and slavery, and temperance, and war, and the millenium, &c., &c., but I hope we can all be tolerable Christians notwithstanding. If Mr. Taylor and his school put the Trinity and Episcopacy upon a level with these things, why of course we must give the matter up. A man who will do so, must be abandoned to the vagaries of his own fancy.

tine could have all charity for the factious peace-destroyer himself, though not one particle for his sentiments; and so I trust Episcopalians will endeavor to have for Dr. Beman, considered as an individual. We may not tolerate his opinions, or his discourteous modes of expressing them; but we *can* remember him, and I presume *shall* remember him when we pray, as in the Litany, May it please thee to forgive our enemies, persecutors, and slanderers, and to turn their hearts. He has indeed rendered himself as fair a mark for invective as most assailants; but it is not our fashion to make war upon individuals, though he can condescend to compare us to the mad Jehu, or madder prize fighters. When he indulges in such strains, we remember the old adage, *Similis simili gaudet*; and are certainly in no danger of breaking the tenth commandment by coveting associations, with which he seems to be familiar. His rude personalities will only recoil upon himself. As says the oriental proverb, "Curses, like young chickens, always go home to roost." Missiles familiar to his hand, will never have better luck than the stone, thrown by Achilles, which was missent, and rebounded into the eye of him that slang it.

*Redit lapis ultor ab osse,
Actorisque sui frontem oculosque petit.*

I have spoken of the sentiments of St. Augustine, and, (to show how his sentiments have been perpetuated by men, who *really* know something of the spirit, as well as order of primitive times,) will add the echo of them, by Mosheim, the erudite and accomplished Lutheran. This is his language towards a reviver of the abominable heresy of Artemon, who taught that our Saviour was a mere man, (*Eusebius Hist. V. 28.*) and hacked the Bible to pieces to eke out his Anti-Christian system. "Non ego ipsum odio habeo; sed errores invado et execror, quibus sese constringi passus est."—*Mosheimii Syntagma Dissert. p. 363. Lipsiae, 1733.*

NOTE F.

Case of Servetus.

As I am doomed to the penalties of a Protestant Inquisition, I suppose it is incumbent on me to say here, that I very well know how coy and touchy some are, respecting the instrumentality of Calvin in the case of Servetus. I judge him, as I presume a sound lawyer would, by *his own* times, and by *his own* avowed sentiments concerning heresy and its punishment, and not by *our* times, and *our* sentiments; and believe it as futile to endeavor his exculpation, as to try the favorite plea of Rome, and maintain that Servetus was given up to the civil powers, and that they, and not ecclesiastics, are blameable for his death.

But granting, for argument's sake, that the *magistrates* of Geneva, and not Calvin, sent Servetus to his stake; Calvin not only believed in the righteousness of such persecution unto death, he justified it with all his might. He actually wrote an elaborate tract to defend the position, that heretics not merely may be, but must be, thus exterminated. I have not space enough for a long extract from it, in the *Nouvelle Biographie Universelle*, but can give the writer's summary of it, in the following words: "Calvin ecrivit un long traite, sur le droit et le necessite de punir les heretiques, non seulement par des peines canoniques, comme dans le primitive Eglise, mais par *le glaive*." Vol. viii. pp. 273, 274.

So Calvin would not only put heretics to death; but vindicate and glorify the act, provided they were put to death by believers in "the true doctrine," *i. e.* his own.* Nay, and as Mr. Dyer shows, in a life of Calvin, made up principally by his own letters as vouchers, (*see pref.*) he could premeditate such an act; and, in the case of Servetus, for no less than a sabbath of years, a good round seven!! (*Dyer's Calvin*, pp. 308, 536.) And, yet, he did not burn Servetus. Oh, no. He had no more instrumentality in the frightful deed, than St. Paul had in the martyrdom of St. Stephen. St. Paul did not throw one of the stones which pelted the protomartyr; he was only "consenting unto his death." St. Paul, however, was honest enough to confess afterward, (*Acts*, xxii. 20,) that, as an accessory to the martyrdom, he was about as guilty as the principals. But the moment some people come in contact with the case of Servetus, their "sensitive-ness of a denominational character" makes them forget St. Paul's straightforwardness, and endeavor to gloss over Calvin's instrumentality in his destruction. They turn aside the guilt from the reformer, whose sweetness was sugar of lead, and fasten it upon civilians. But they are little aware what an unapostolic example they are copying. *Ecclesia abhorret a sanguine*, says the Jesuit: the State burns heretics, not *we*. Aye, no doubt; but what would *we*, the Church, do, if the magistrate let the vile heretic

* See Dyer's Calvin p. 354, Eng. edit. The same sentiment about the legitimacy of persecution, (provided it were indulged by *proper hands* only,) was afterwards maintained by John Cotton, "the patriarch of New England," in his celebrated book against Roger Williams, called "The Bloody Tenet, washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb"—a title which sounds as if the work had been issued by a press belonging to the Romish Inquisition! Cotton fully justifies Calvin, in his teaching about the punishment of heretics by civil magistrates; as also Beza, his successor, for a book containing similar crimson-dyed doctrine. He pronounces both "strong and accurate."—(*Bloody Tenet*, p. 181.) Strong enough they were, Heaven knows, to carry off all the defences of poor heretics, as easily as Samson bore away the gates of Gaza. And, but for the melancholy character of the subjects, it would be amusing to see with what complete Jesuitical sophistry, Master Cotton vindicates the physical punishment of an anti-puritanical rebel. "He is not punished for his conscience," says he, "but for sinning against his conscience."—(p. 9.) And Philip II. and Torquemada himself would have said, Amen.

go unscorched? The Jesuit was silent on that head; for he well knew, that the magistrate would be excommunicated himself, and consigned to all excommunication's legitimate woes.

Now, it so happens, that the Genevan magistrates *did* hesitate about the execution of Servetus. An appeal was made "to the Swiss Churches," by them, "in order to remove their own scruples." Calvin opposed this appeal, because *he* had no scruples whatsoever. (*Dyer's Calvin*, p. 344.) So Calvin did anything but interfere to prevent that death with which he had so long before threatened Servetus. Oh, yes he did, says his extenuator, he asked for a milder — what? milder sentence? Alas, nothing near such a genuine boon. What then? Why, for a "milder death!" Why, then, had he not made provision for such a death, in the legal reforms, (for Calvin dabbled in human as well as in Divine law,) which had been entrusted to him in Geneva? Ah, *his* legal reforms left untouched upon the statute-book, the law for torture *forte et ferme*, and for the stake with its blazing faggots as a remedy for ecclesiastical sins. (*Dyer*, pp. 193, 345.) But he *did* ask for a milder death. His own letter denies any such interference; (*Dyer*, p. 345;) but give him, nevertheless, all credit for the precious abatement. Then, instead of consuming him in half an hour, (Servetus's time of dying,) by faggots and brimstone, he would have had him broken to pieces upon the wheel, for a good many half hours! Yes, let Calvin's mercy be fully commemorated; he would have his culprits a comfortable while a dying, so it be not by actual flames! This is as famous as the clemency of the Puritans, who actually doomed Abp. Laud to the gallows, as a vulgar malefactor; but finally consented he should die on the block, as a gentlemanly felon. I am not drawing upon my fancy: the archbishop narrowly escaped hanging! (*Hook's Biog. Dict.* vi. 653.)

On the whole, I do not think this desperately unfortunate case can be summed up in more expressive words, than those of Mr. Dyer. He composed his biography of Calvin, after a full review of the labors of others, and by the aid of Calvin's *own letters*; a sort of testimony, which, as the lawyers know, gives us the *animus* of a man — turns his character inside out. Before all these authorities, this is his solemn verdict; showing that he held indeed a divining rod, which enabled him to penetrate to the secret springs of Calvin's disposition. "An irritable pride is one of the salient points of his character. Of this, the preceding narrative has recorded many striking instances. This feeling particularly betrayed itself, where Calvin's *literary reputation*, or his *authority as a teacher*, was concerned; for these were the instruments of his power and influence. He loved Castellio, till their views began to clash; and then he pursued

him with the most unrelenting malignity. Though acquainted with the views of Socinus, and the other Italian Antitrinitarians, he tolerated those heretics, so long as they flattered him; but when he discovered that this flattery was a mere cloak and pretence, his indignation knew no bounds. Nay, he even endured and corresponded with Servetus, the arch-heretic of them all, until he found himself ridiculed and abused by the Spaniard, and then he formed the resolution of putting him to death; a design which he cherished for seven years, and which he effected the moment it was in his power to do so; and that in spite of the mild and tolerant principles, which his understanding, when calm and unruffled, had led him deliberately to lay down."—*Dyer's Calvin*, pp. 535, 536.*

In sheer ignorance of such overwhelming testimony as this, Dr. Beman ventures to upbraid me for historical inaccuracy, and grievous want of capabilities to discriminate, when I simply appealed to Calvin's treatment of Servetus to show that he was exclusive. That is the most which he can make out of the Lecture itself, cling as he will to a newspaper report, for which I am under no more responsibility than the child unborn; and then be all the while wiping his mouth in innocence, and calling his neighbors to a reckoning under the ninth commandment! Solomon might have sent such a man to study his Proverbs. (Prov. xxx. 20.)

Moreover, the Lecture praises Calvin, so far as it can; and to others I may say, though never to Dr. Beman, "forgive me this wrong." I have no manner of doubt that Calvin had good points, as well as bad ones: in spite of his own doctrine, he was not a mere "lump of *total* depravity." For instance, he was a reasonably sound churchman about the sacraments and sacramental grace; although he was a terribly high one—worse than a Puseyite—about priestly authority. The long and the short of the matter no doubt is, that Calvin had an ungovernable and implacable temper: as one of his own brother ministers said of him, "if he once takes a spite against a man, he never forgives." (Dyer, 202.) Questionless, the speaker was thinking of such cases as those of Ameaux, and Gruet, and Bolsec, and Berthelier, and Castellio, and Gribaldo, and Perrin, *et it genus omne*. Calvin, too, was Catholic in his antipathies. He was just as violent in politics, as in polemics; like the old Calvinistic ministers of New England, and *some* of their modern representatives. Our discerning biographer, in the dictionary before alluded to, has carefully noticed this, and graphically says, "Calvin ne fut pas plus indulgent, pour l'opposition politique, que pour l'heresie."—*Nouv. Biog. Univ.* viii. 274.

* Hoffman in his *Lexicon* has hit upon the same solution of Calvin's violence. He traces it to *ingens invidia*.—Hoff. Lex. iii. 158. col. b.—It is a most remarkable and painful fact, that the later editions of Calvin's *Institutes* *left out* important concessions about toleration! (*Dyer*, p. 34.)

Dr. Beman's representation of Calvin's case is now before the Trojan public, and mine alongside of it; and I hope that public will not judge me altogether unmercifully, albeit he threatens me with a stoppage of breath if I speak my mind a little too freely on *his* Trojanic manor. Such a stoppage (etouffement) was, to the letter, that very infliction, with which Calvin was in the habit of menacing his opponents. (*Bergier's Dict. Theol.* i. 400.) I beg, therefore, to plead that I was certainly not aware, the intelligent and high-minded community, amid which I have lately found myself domiciled, had turned Italian, elected a pope, and established a prohibitory index. And if they have, I must further beg to remind them, that, for the first time in their history, they have forgotten the courtesy due to a stranger, and not given him notice of his surroundings. However, *ignorantia facti excusat*, as barrister Broom says in his learned book on legal maxims; and duly entering this demurrer, I shall venture to add, that a man who arraigns his neighbors for unscholarly defalcations, and has microscopic eyes enough to fault a poor *was* for a *were*, in composition not belonging to that neighbor, and then charge him with the blame, should not himself be caught napping about a matter of common geography. Dr. Beman is continually associating the name of Servetus with Vienna, and has actually six times over confounded Vienne in France, with Vienna in Austria, and with Murdock's Mosheim open before his eyes. I have known tyros in Church History often fall into this self-same error; but grown men, sensitive about "historical accuracy" and "discrimination," with a guide-book in view, into the bargain, are generally on their guard against such a common-place blunder.* Probably, however, the poor printer has got to shoulder this sin; and so we will leave *him* to beseech the lynx-eyed contributor to his pages, to keep in his querulous moods within hail of the old geographical proverb, "He fell into the pit which he digged for other."

* It is spelt Vienne in Murdock's Mosheim, and in Maclaine's Mosheim also; though Dr. B. picked up all his learning from the first of these works, where any body else could find it, in the time it took to burn Servetus—half an hour. If he had looked into Maclaine, he would have found him sustaining, and, if possible, more than sustaining Mr. Dyer. "It is impossible," says Dr. Maclaine, "to justify the conduct of Calvin, in the case of Servetus; whose death will be an indelible reproach upon the character of that great and eminent reformer." (*Mac. Mos.* iv. 474.—*Note.*) Dr. Maclaine, Presbyterian though he were, comes plumply up to the mark; and knows nothing about the Jesuitical extenuation of a "milder death." He can find no way of accounting for Calvin's atrocity, but by supposing there was a good deal of the old Romish leaven left in him.

The city of Vienne is one with which tyros have to be familiar; for it was the place of banishment to two notorious characters in Sacred History, viz: Archelaus and Pontius Pilate. (*Jahn's Hebrew Commonwealth*, pp. 421, 428.)

Since writing the above, I have seen Dr. Beman's seventh illustration of "the mountains in labor." It is quite elaborate *for him*, and about as correct as one might anticipate from a man boastful of his own accuracy, and censorious of the inaccuracy of others; who yet does not know geography enough to distinguish between a city in France, and a city in Austria, in a case which has, unquestionably, led thousands of his readers entirely astray. I will give the public some specimens, and they may judge of the rest by my samples: *ex pede Herculem*. I will refer to cases at the beginning and end; which surely will be enough for the candid.

"Calvin," says Dr. B., "it is well known, was the author of several of the forms in the Book of Common Prayer." He refers particularly to the introductory sentences, the Exhortation, the Confession, and the Absolution. This is not *very* well known, except as a downright mistake. The accurate Mr. Procter asserts, roundly and properly, "No part, however, of our Formularies can be traced to his [Calvin's] influence." (*Procter on the P. Book*, p. 41.) There will be no use in Dr. Beman's quoting authors against this statement; as he threatened to do, if it were questioned. I have myself the original and transcendent authority, (Calvin's own book,) in no less than three different forms, in the Phenix, in Daniel's Codex Liturgicus, and in the parallel Middleburgh Liturgy, preserved by Mr. Peter Hall in his Reliquiæ.

The truth is, that Dr. B. has blundered again, and confounded things totally different. It is possible, as Mr. Procter admits, that some hints were taken from the Liturgy of Valerandus Pollanus; but him Calvin signalized not with his ordinary pet phrase, "a beast," but with one which he let off when a *Jupiter Tonans*. He denounced Pollanus as "a devil"; (*Dyer*, pp. 437-8;) and so there is no great likelihood, that he would have stood sponsor for any of his diabolical tinkerings upon the English liturgy. In fact, Calvin had marvellously little of that tender endearment towards this liturgy, which Dr. B. inconsiderately ascribes to him. The first time he was made acquainted with its contents, he took occasion to abuse it heartily; for Calvin's vocabulary in the way of vituperation was "a springing well," which never grew dry. (*Dyer*, pp. 405, 443.) The genial-tempered historian Fuller does not hesitate to vouch for this abusiveness, and comments upon its issues in the following language: "This struck such a stroke, especially in the congregation of Frankfort, that some therein, who formerly partly approved, did afterwards wholly dislike, and more, who formerly disliked, did now detest the English Liturgy." (*Fuller's Ch. Hist.* new ed. iv. 215.) This was in 1555; while in 1552 (*three years before*) Calvin, according to Dr. Beman, became "the author of several of the forms in the Book of Common Prayer." Yet in 1555, as Fuller proves, he is *first* made ac-

quainted with it, in a Latin translation of it, sent him by Knox and others then residing at Frankfort. And so then, after he had known enough of it, to actually compose important forms inserted among its offices, he turns around, and so abuses it, as to make it an object of detestation ; and that, too, when (like some of his followers,) he loved obsequiousness and flattery better even than the stiffness of orthodoxy ! Alas, poor Calvin, if his voice had not gone down to dusty death, and could reach the ears of such a champion as our Doctor of “ discrimination,” it would bolt out the old Spanish proverb, ‘ The Lord save me from my friends ; and I will myself take care of my enemies.’

Dr. Beman makes history, when he attempts to cut a figure in it, but confusion worse confounded. No wonder he is so in love with “ the impassioned hyperbole.” He solemnly declares, that no man has a better right than himself to mount this rhetoric upon stilts. His pontifical brief upon this point will, I humbly presume, receive catholic acquiescence.

So much for the beginning of the paper alluded to. Now for another portion, where John Knox becomes conspicuous. There is not the slightest question about *this* Reformer’s connexion with the Church of England, since *he* was Episcopally ordained ; whereas, it has been stontly denied, that Calvin had ordination of any sort. If Dr. B. can give us the time and place of his ordination, he will certainly do historical accuracy a favor. He received only the tonsure in the Church of Rome ; but that is a preparation for ordination, and no part of ordination itself, according to Bergier. (*Dyer*, p. 7. *Bergier’s Dict.* viii. 148.) In Geneva he accepted, it is said, the place of minister and professor of theology ; but not a word can I find about his sacerdotal consecration. He had often preached before he got to Geneva, and that, probably, was consecration sufficient. (*Hooker’s Polity*, Preface, sect. 2.]

As to Knox, it was not his Calvinism which drove him away from England and its Church, but a foible of a somewhat different character. John had a “ holy horror ” of petticoat government, or, as he himself styled it, “ the monstrous regiment of women ; ” and being somewhat afraid of Queen Bess’s application of it to his “ sensitiveness of a denominational character,” he made himself scarce (as the phrase goes) in her Majesty’s dominions, and ensconced himself safely in Scotland. Notwithstanding, even there “ the old leaven ” stuck fast by him. He launched the Kirk with an Episcopate for a helm, and a Prayer Book for a compass ; original virtues rather than original sins, which it is a vast pity the Kirk ever threw overboard. He sent his sons into England to be educated, where they turned out such excellent churchmen, as to become fellows, both of them, in an English Uni-

versity. Such hostility to Episcopacy as this, we can afford to tolerate.*

So much for Dr. B.'s efforts to endeavor to prove Calvin, and John Knox, *quasi* Episcopalians. Calvin was less of one, and Knox more of one, than he ever knew before. Nevertheless, being born one himself, he is full confident that *he* understands what *genuine* Episcopacy is, and pitches upon a gentleman of the Church of England, who attended the Synod of Dort, as an Episcopalian after his own heart. This gentleman has a familiar face enough, to well-read Churchmen; though Dr. B. seems hardly to know his features, and describes him by a circumlocution. The individual in question, is no less than good old Joseph Hall; who was once somewhat of a Puritanizer in his younger days, but who, when he reached the period of "discrimination," and "historical accuracy," wrote a treatise on "Episcopacy by Divine Right," in which occurs the following tolerably significant sentence. "It can be no great comfort, or credit, to the disparagers of Episcopacy, that the only founder and abettor of their opinion, which we meet with in all the world of history and record, is a branded heretic, Ærius; branded even for this very point, which they now maintain." (*Hall's Works*, x. 237.)

Yet, says Dr. B., "give us such an Episcopacy" as that of Hall, and his contemporaries. Well, I hope in due time he may get its commission, and become at least a deacon, *apostolico more*.† And when that happens, we may enjoy the singular privilege of hearing Dr. B. in an Episcopal pulpit; where, if he gives us an echo of the supralapsarian preaching, which he heard with such rapture in the English Establishment, we shall not quarrel with him, provided he does not insist (Calvin-like) that we may not contradict him. The seventeenth Article would undoubtedly authorize him to preach upon the subject of Predestination, since the Article states it plainly, as *a fact*; only *without* the annexation of a philo-

* Knox's Episcopacy with its superintendents and liturgy lasted for years. In the "Booke of the Universall Kirk," reprinted by Peterkin in 1839, one of these officers seems to have a sort of archiepiscopal grandeur. He is called "Superintendent of the West." p. 99.

As to Knox's Liturgy, or "Book of Common Order," it was reprinted in London, in 1840, by Dr. Cumming, now the most popular Presbyterian Minister in London. The Dr. added a preface highly commending forms. The publisher was J. Leslie, 52, Great Queen Street. Edinburgh, R. Grant & Sons. 12mo. pp. 265.

† If I do say *apostolico more*, it seems to me that Dr. B. *himself* can hardly complain, i. e. if the report of a Sermon of his, in a Troy newspaper, has any correctness. If I treated him, as he has treated me, I could quote that report without hesitation. In it, Dr. B. is represented as sturdily denying that he is a Presbyterian, *jure divino*. Taking this as a postulate, I naturally infer, that he is a Presbyterian, *jure humano*; and claims no authority beyond that given him by a vote of his congregation. All Episcopalians would cheerfully acknowledge him as a minister in this sense. He *is* a minister, bishop, metropolitan, patriarch, cardinal, pope, or whatever he chooses to call himself, *jure humano*!

sophical theory, and *with* the annexation of God's promises of mercy, lest the curious and the carnal abuse it to a "dangerous downfall." This, of course, suits, not our magisterial doctor, and he pronounces the Article Calvinism undiluted; though the grand question of the basis of God's purposes, as founded, or not founded, upon foreseen merits, (the gist of the whole bitter and endless controversy between Calvinists and Arminians,) is utterly ignored in it, as it is in the Bible, and both these formidable classes of antagonists accordingly take it, as they do the Bible itself, *each in its own way*. Now predestination as a fact simply, with no mitigation from the Divine promises, yet, with a margin for discretion as to theories, has not proved so very hard of digestion, as Dr. B. fancies; and is anything but an exclusively evangelical doctrine. Pagan philosophers have believed in it. Pantheists, like Spinoza, have believed in it.* Infidels, like Hobbes, have believed in it. Socinians, like Priestley, have believed in it. The Mohammedans believe in it, most affectionately. We allow people to believe in it, to their hearts' content, in the Episcopal Church, as we do in Slavery or Abolitionism, in Maine laws or Anti-Maine laws; provided they are quiet about such things, and do not insist that their neighbors shall believe in them, *after their fashion*. But with all our grievous high-churchmanship, we are pretty tolerable Protestants, against the aggressive dogmatism of individuals upon their own *ipse dixits*.

NOTE G.

The Puritans.

Dr. Beman expresses immeasurable surprise at my audacity, in supposing the Church of England could be tolerant towards them; and themselves strong patterns of the very intolerance they complained of. His surprise is far less than mine, at his faint disclaimer, in one of his papers, of intentional personality, after having freely indulged it; and his return to it with increased violence for the temporary remission in his constitutional fever—his all but broadly pronouncing me capable of deliberate falsehood.

Naturam expelles furca, tamen usque recurret?

I am fully prepared for such surprise among the completely one-sided, having commenced my experience upon that subject, some twenty years ago, as detailed in my book on the Puritans. See pp. 17, 18. That book though abused without stint, has gradually made its way through the community; and is still threading a passage into curious labyrinths, being assisted

* Moshemii Syntag. Dissert. p. 107.

by such aid as attacks, similar to Dr. Beman's, now and then give it. Such attacks have done it more service, than advertisements paid for in the newspapers ! It has stood its ground well ; for I never yet saw but one assailant, who needed any special reply. My rejoinder to him, ten years ago, was ample ; but I desire to speak of him with consideration and esteem, as he has since abandoned Puritanical Congregationalism, and become an Old-School Presbyterian.

Of course, having gone over the ground of Puritanism most fully, it is altogether superfluous for me to traverse it a second time. Dr. Beman may therefore indulge his surprise, till it turns into an anodyne, and puts him soundly to sleep. He may then dream of Puritan pageantry unmolested by me. But if my neighbors of Dutch origin, will read what I have said in behalf of Dutchmen, from p. 106 and onward, and in my 69th Note, on p. 475, *they* probably will not sympathize very deeply in the Doctor's carminative hallucinations. If the Baptists will read what is said in *their* behalf, from p. 279, to p. 306, they, probably, will have more sympathy for the Dutch, than for the Doctor, and will not deem the Puritans worthy, *quite yet*, of canonization. From p. 306 to 333, might make even the quiet blood of a Quaker move a little more rapidly at the name of a Puritan, even if, as in duty bound, he gave it no malediction. And if the Old-School Presbyterians will read *all* that is written, from p. 361 to 394, I am reasonably sure, that they would leave Dr. Beman, the next time his Pegasus is mounted for Puritan championship, all "alone in his glory."

Dr. Beman, however, promised a "*rigid ordeal of facts*," and then went straight to *quotations* from *modern* authors ; while I went to original sources, and quoted the favorite authorities of the Puritans, a thousand times over. Indeed, I was bitterly complained of, by one reviewer, for quoting so many musty old volumes, which nobody, now-a-days, could readily get at !

To show how easy it is to pass the "rigid ordeal" of one of his strongest *facts*, his reference to Macaulay about the behavior of the Puritans, in the times of the Spanish Armada, I would simply say, that *that* was the period, when the Puritans let out their most concentrated venom against the Church and Government of England, in the tracts of Martin Mar-Prelate. See *Puritanism*, pp. 52, 53 ; and *Note 47*, on p. 460.*

However, the Dr. is in love with Macaulay ; and so I will give him one of Macaulay's bitter-sweet *entremets*, with which he sometimes adorns his

* The Dutch Churches, at the same time, put her on her guard, and tried to help her. All praise to them ! *Rose's Biog. Dict.* vii. 79, col. a.

historical dinner-table. If the Dr. will swallow *his* half without wincing, I will promise to get *mine* down, with what gusto I can. "The training of the High Church ended in the reign of the Puritans; and the training of the Puritans in the reign of the harlots." Comp. *Macaulay's Miscellanies*, i. pp. 312, 313.

The Dr. quotes also Mr. Bancroft. But, unfortunately, he, too, like Macaulay, can speak *in alto*, and *in basso*. If the Dr. knew all Mr. B. had said, in his first edition, and left unsaid afterwards, I am afraid he would not be quite so fond of him. Mr. Bancroft's case has been considered before. See *Puritanism*, Notes 53, 54, on pp. 463, 464; also, p. 245, and the foot-note.

But it cannot be necessary for me to dilate upon topics, on which my sentiments have already been given to the world, on more than five hundred pages, studded with references. If my labor is to be demolished, those references go with it; and, then, the very volumes out of which the Puritans themselves are accustomed to quote, not *opinions* but *facts*, perish also in this "wreck of matter and crush of" books. And the Dr. ought to give me some trifle of credit, when I say, that if the Temple of Puritan Self-glorification is to come tumbling, my work may go (and welcome) into the same heap of ruins.

I will now merely add three or four facts, in relation to the Puritans, which may be not untimely for some of my uninformed readers, and then dismiss the subject entirely.

First, then, the Puritans were regular Church and State men. Yet, says Dr. Beman, "A State religion, whether Lutheran, Episcopal, or Presbyterian, has a fibre of Romanism in it." So mote it be, *doctor irrefragabilis*. The last fibre of this constitutional ailment was eliminated from Episcopal Virginia, by the American Revolution. But Puritan Connecticut, and, more especially, Puritan Massachusetts, hung to it with a death-grapple. Connecticut never surrendered her last fibre, till about 1820. Massachusetts, a yet tougher subject, held out till 1834. (See *Puritanism*, Note 8, p. 433.) Where did the Romish fibre stick longest?

Secondly, the Puritans pursued the Church and State system, when Episcopal Virginia, and even Roman Catholic Maryland, were setting them a much better example. Virginia started on the regular democratic platform of "universal suffrage and equality." What a marvel for those days! Why, we glorify it now, as one of the great features of American liberty. (Note 53, p. 463.) But the Puritans allowed no one the rights of a free-man, "not admitted of their Church." (*Puritanism*, p. 77.) Roman Catholic Maryland began — would that Dr. Brownson had caught its *ancient*

spirit — with “free liberty of religion.” (*Puritanism*, Note 62, p. 469.) Its example is contrasted with that of Puritanism in the Note referred to.

Thirdly, the Puritans practised slavery in a way which the most intense Southerner, upon that subject, would account an utter abomination. They sold *freemen* into its bondage! (*Puritanism*, p. 311, and its last foot note but one; pp. 419, 421, 422, and p. 494, Note, 88; and the third foot note, which shows that Cromwell sold prisoners for a shilling apiece!!)

Fourthly, and finally, in this inglorious series, the Puritans had a fugitive-slave law. Yes, and a fugitive-slave law much more stringent than *our* late law, passed by Congress. This law too was not a by-law, or a statute, but part of a solemn political constitution! It was inserted into the old compact, between the confederate colonies of Plymouth, Massachusetts, Connecticut and New Haven. I once heard this law referred to, by a Congregationalist, in a Puritan pulpit, in a fourth of July oration, requested by a Puritan city. And the bare mention of such a palpable historical fact, though by a Puritan orator, under a Puritan canopy, and amid Puritan auspices, did not protect the speaker from hisses. Such is the raw and viperous testiness of *some* persons, the moment you soil the escutcheon of Puritanism, with the touch of a camel's hair pencil. They are ready to hiss you out of existence; unless (Calvin-like) in a spasm of generosity, they devote you to “a milder death.”

NOTE H.

Examinations of Candidates.

Dr. B. supposes I was here quarreling with the examinations of candidates for communion in a kirk-session; and offers to prove the propriety of such examinations by Scripture! This is another of his blunders, for trusting to reports, and making a mere sketch responsible for *language*; which is something more than even worldly politicians would think fair. I am not speaking against legitimate, but illegitimate; not against written, but unwritten rules: customs, such as multitudes have indulged in, of saying what I instance on p. 20, that no man has any vital piety, unless he come up to the self-created standard of some of his neighbors. Say some mens' shibboleths; and you are a saint. Leave them unsaid; and, as the stereotyped phrase goes, You have no more religion than a horse. Since I began these notes, I have encountered an instance of this summary method of treatment, inflicted on a parishioner. This parishioner wished to leave another denomination, and become an Episcopalian. The step was strongly objected to. Why? “Because there is not one particle of real religion in the Episcopal church. The Gospel is never preached *there*.”

They believe in no such thing as a change of heart, *there*." We pray daily all Lent long, (to say nothing of other times,) and in just so many words, for "new and contrite hearts;" and yet this awful judgment, so far as it could go, doomed the whole Episcopal Church to everlasting perdition! And it was as coolly uttered, as if it had been a censure upon the broad brim of a Quaker's hat! (Compare Note 132, pp. 526, 527, of Puritanism, &c.

And was not this exclusiveness? No, by no means; because Calvin settled it long ago, that "those who hold the true doctrine" may, not proscribe only, but, if necessary, persecute too. (*Dyer's Calvin* p. 354.) The *comperti veritatis* (that was his idea, and language,) are competent to any ecclesiastical judgment whatsoever. Very wholesome doctrine this, among the Jesuits;* and acted on by many a person not Jesuitical in *name*, but perfectly Jesuitical in *principles of action*. The persons whom Calvin signalizes had another title given them by Harry Nicholas, the old Familist, whom the Puritans so much disliked, because he stole *their* prerogative of condemning every body, who did not come square up to "the pattern in the Mount," i. e. *their* pattern. Harry was not a whit behind Calvin in pretensions; and he rather beat him in rhetoric. He dubbed *his* disciples, "Seniores sanctae intelligentiae," Elders of the Holy Understanding. [*Bp. Hall's Wks.* x. 263.]

It seems curious enough to a philosophical observer, that people who think they only have got *a true religion*, should complain bitterly of those, who, (it is pretended,) think they only have got *a true church*. The last claim is not one hundredth part so unkind, or so presumptuous, as the other. Nor one hundredth part so paganish either; since the self-righteousness, which will allow no virtue out of its own pale, is a copy of the old Porphyrianism; which taught that God was too subtle to be seen by any but the elect. *Eusebius Praep. Evang. Lib. iii. ch. 7.*

* The doctrine of the Jesuits was, that any man might persecute who had the *jus acquisitum*, the right prescriptive. Such was the explanation of the famous, or infamous, Father Parsons. (*Foulis's Romish Treasons*, p. 722.) Most amusing is it to see, how all these theories, while they vary in expression, agree substantially in spirit, and come to the same practical conclusion.

I have not given in the text, the highest title of arrogation, employed by the Puritans. I did not then have it by me; but have since found it, in Hoornbeek's *Summa Controversiarum*. It is, "Zion's prerogative royal." Old Hoornbeek was a very honest, but unfortunately very pragmatical Dutchman, who put some things down *just as they were*. The Puritans denounced him cordially. See Hoornbeek's *Sum.*, p. 787. Utrecht, 1658.

NOTE I.

Confirmation.

It has been objected to this statement, that I ignored the Rubric at the end of the Confirmation Office, which runs in the following words. "And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion, until such time as he be confirmed; or, be ready and desirous to be confirmed."

Unquestionably, this is the rule of the Episcopal Church for *habitual* communicants. And so the various denominations, (or churches, or pope-doms, if they covet big titles—and there certainly are Protestant popes, as well as Romish ones,*) the various denominations round us practice upon quite as exclusive a regimen, for *their* habitual communicants. They subject applicants to an examination before a kirk-session, or some ecclesiastical committee. They require a statement of religious experiences, or the owning of some "solemn league and covenant," or the assent to some creed, which has no sanction but the vote of a solitary congregation. Nevertheless, though thus scrupulously particular for *habitual* communicants who come under their own eye, and whose cases they are bound to be personally acquainted with, they relax the rule for *occasional* communicants, for visitants, or strangers, or travellers; *and so do we*. The Church of England, and the Episcopal Church in these United States, have never, so far as I know, refused occasional communion to "all, who profess and call themselves Christians," and give a solemn Amen, in the presence of Almighty God, his Ministers, and his people, to the appeal beginning, "Ye who do truly and earnestly repent you, &c." These churches very well know that by their own rubrics, a mere *desire* for Confirmation sometimes qualifies for the Eucharist, without the formal act. Now even if the formal act be wanting in one part of it, the imposition of hands, it may not be wanting in another part of it, a solemn profession of the Gospel. And, not improbably, by an acceptance of one half, they charitably hope to awaken a desire for the other half, a benediction, which, to say the least of it, cannot harm the most scrupulous mortal that breathes. Oh, when they are trying to exercise and extend such a charity, cannot their vituperators be slightly kind enough, to abstain from upbraiding them with inconsistency?

For myself, I can say, that I have seen the Holy Communion administered to a Presbyterian minister, in the posture of *standing*; and that, too, in the presence of the Bishop of Connecticut, now the Presiding Bishop of

* A shrewd old Congregational divine of New England used to say, it was idle for Congregationalists to quarrel about the bishops of Episcopalians, since they had worse ones themselves—bishops who governed by *unwritten authority*. Unwritten authority is always most loved by the loudest croakers about parity and equality.

our whole Church, venerable for his years, beloved for his virtues, honored for his orthodoxy. The posture, as I understood, was asked as a favor; and the good Bishop, very flexible in his courtesies, though inflexible in his principles, granted the concession willingly. If Dr. Beman should ever present himself at the chancel of St. Paul's Church, Troy, "in love and charity with his neighbors," and ask a similar gratification, I am quite inclined to believe, its Rector would not shrink from copying the example of the senior officer of his Church. And if that is latitudinarianism, why carp-ers may make the most of it.

NOTE J.

Ultra-Protestantism.

This is a passage of the Lecture, which has suffered peculiarly at the hands of newspaper reporters, and has been represented to mean, that I declared myself more willing to be a Papist than a Presbyterian. This is the passage, also, which made me the author of a bran-new theological system.

It has perplexed Dr. Beman immeasurably; for he has magnified it into a "philosophical delineation" of Romanism and Ultra-Protestantism in general—the one, as addressing all its arguments to the *head*; and the other, as addressing all its arguments to the *heart*. I do not wonder the poor Doctor was terribly gravelled by such abnormous philosophy; or that he should staidly and grandiosely declare, he never met with anything like it, in all the books he ever read ancient or modern—nay, that it is so utterly unlike anything he had ever conceived of, in his devious theological wanderings, he must award me the honor of having developed at last a *single* originality! He claims that I caricature philosophy; and as there is very little doubt that the reporter has caricatured me, between us both, the Dr. has had a sweet time of it. He boggles sorely as he begins, and says, "If I understand this description"; but at length he flounders along, and then we have *his* philosophical delineation for a parallel! *Ar-cades ambo*, let them both

—————"upwhirled aloft,
Fly o'er the backside the world far off,
Into a Limbo large and broad, since called
The Paradise of Fools."

In sober earnest, I do not profess to understand myself, what my reporter would be at, in the long paragraph which the Dr. quoted, and of which he endeavors to give me the honors of a matchless paternity. And I really lament that the Doctor has exhausted upon it his most ponderous logic, and his most superlative rhetoric, all to no purpose; and been as

laboriously, but as vainly, valorous, as Don Quixote when he battled the wind-mill.

The plain and simple truth at last comes out, that I made not the slightest attempt, (I certainly did not so much as dream of making one,) to contrast Romanism and Ultra-Protestantism as systems; and had not the remotest thought of drawing up and marshalling, (as the Dr. will have it,) their separate "philosophical delineation." All I said, all I wished to say, all that my argument required me to say, was, that I had rather have Episcopalians attacked, as Roman Catholics attack them, by faulting their theology; than attacked in the way in which too many of their Protestant neighbors attack them, by faulting their piety. It is *rather* better (I should think) even in the eyes of Dr. Beman himself, that one's *opinions* should be assailed, than his *personal religion*. And yet, upon the caricature (for I can call it nothing else) of such a very plain and harmless enunciation, there has been founded enough of abuse and invective, if beaten out into foil, to cover the whole Episcopal church from Maine down to Texas.

Now if I were to respond to such treatment, *more Bemanico*, I should fume, and begin to talk about the ten commandments, and bearing false witness. Or, if in one of the Doctor's fits of rhetorical hysterics, I should talk of the "impassioned hyperbole." But I really do not care enough about his blunders, to take them so seriously. I had much rather laugh over them, and when I see how he has tugged away to make a mountain out of a mole-hill, say as Prince Harry did to Falstaff, "O monstrous, eleven buckram men grown out of two!" And I am charitable enough to believe, that when Dr. Beman's volcano has discharged (*si possibile*) the whole of its lava, and a little more snow has fallen upon its crater—when the prospect of his long home, already near, has come nearer, that even *he* will indulge one—one at least—invisible smile, at his own ridiculous errors, and say to himself, The next time I pick up a newspaper report, I will be a little more careful.

The portion of my lecture now under consideration, was doubly unfortunate. It was misreported in the Budget, as well as in the Traveller; and the Budget seemed particularly anxious to make me say, I had much rather be a Papist than a Presbyterian. I know not the subterranean aim of this reporter; but if his actual design was to stigmatize me as an enemy to Presbyterians, he did me an egregious wrong. There are many Presbyterians whom I hold to be almost, if not altogether churchmen—whose conservative and orthodox opinions have my sympathy, and whose characters I sincerely respect. I can speak of some of them, in even a higher tone; for I have found nothing in Episcopacy to teach me disesteem for my old instructors, Miller and Alexander, of the Seminary at Prince-

ton—both of them now, I doubt not, in Paradise, and whose virtues are yet fragrant in my recollections. To Dr. Miller my debt is peculiar; and I am not sorry to have an opportunity to give it a public acknowledgment. He was the first person on earth, who ever taught me, from reason, from history, and from the Bible, the doctrine of an apostolic succession in the Christian Ministry. So deep was the impression which his earnest and varied and reiterated instructions made upon my youthful mind, that this article of Christian Discipline has ever since been a matter of cordial belief with me. I have only changed its *venue*, as my lawyer friends would express it, and clung to the succession as traceable through bishops rather than presbyters.

CONCLUSION.

Dr. Beman's twelfth paper contains his last and deadliest thrust; which, of course, is intended to be fatal. All his virulence is roused and concentrated for this final effort; and the history of the island of Melita is renewed in an important particular — “there came a viper out of the heat.” He fastens on my integrity as a theologian, and poisons it all without a solitary compunction. He then fastens on my integrity as a man, and endeavors to make that also the victim of his bane. “Atro dente me petiverit.”

His first grand aim is to prove me a miserable Romanizer. Unfortunately, this charge confirms to the letter, what I say on p. 21st of the Lecture, that Episcopalians are represented continually as Romanists in disguise. I was afraid some of my people would think I spake too strongly there. Now that their Rector is denounced as such a Romanist, they can judge whether my language was unwarranted. Unfortunately, also, this charge is one of the commonest tricks possible with a controversial defamer; and has been played off upon such men as John Calvin and Richard Baxter, just as recklessly as upon Churchmen. I state a simple historical fact, which it would be easy to prove, if it were necessary. A more satisfactory instance, probably, in the view of many, will be an historical fact yet more extraordinary, viz: that the whole Baptist denomination have suffered in precisely the same way. Of this fact, formal proof shall be given; and it comes from the pages of Thomas Grantham himself, one of the magnates of Baptist ecclesiastical history. In his *Christianismus Primitivus*, he explicitly says, “And indeed this is an ordinary aspersion, which hath been cast upon *those in general* to whom I am related on a religious account, viz: That we are all Papists, or will turn Papists, &c.” (*Book 4, p. iii.*) I give the sentence as Grantham himself gives it; for he ends it with an &c., showing that the aspersion was often varied: “got up,” as Dr. B. phrases it, “to suit a new set of circumstances.”

So in calling his neighbors Romanizers, the Dr. is only imitating a pitiful game, which calumniators of the earlier Protestant times began ; and he may find "his own place" in such an unapostolical succession, without let or hindrance. But, for all that, he does not allow me to escape, with the chance of being myself singly a Romanist. I am to make converts to follow me. Now I have no special desire to be prophetic ; but I must say, in answer to such a formidable predestination of *my* labors, that *his* own stand just as good a chance for making converts in a more questionable direction. Already men, who might easily be attracted to better things, by the halo of Christian meekness and gentleness around a silvered head, begin to say of his long yet constantly belligerent life, and most discourteous methods of controversy, that if such things are an exemplification of genuine Christianity, they can never be Christians. *His* chances, then, for making unlooked for converts, are, to say the least of it, quite as fair as mine ; and albeit I have not said, I had rather be a Roman Catholic than a Presbyterian, I will *now* say as much as this, That if I am to be manufacturing Romanizers, while he is manufacturing unbelievers, my converts are certainly the most respectable.

But the Dr. returns to the charge *cum totis viribus*, and attempts to liken my Lecture to a certain discourse of Abp. Hughes himself ! Now, he is sure he has caught it with St. Dominic's pinchers ; for he solemnly avers, that "Whole sentences, and even paragraphs, might be transferred from *either* to the *other*, without breaking up the symmetry of the whole." I am not at all familiar with the Archbishop's *theological language*, but his *example* as a controvertist I am somewhat familiar with ; and am sorry to find the Dr. an imitator of the Archbishop's faults, though by no means of his talent. Indeed, availing myself of the Doctor's "philosophical delineation" of that power and pertinency of "internal evidence," by which he presumes to prove that my reporter had sight of my manuscript, and that Ap. Hughes and myself have composed interchangeable paragraphs, I feel abundantly competent to prove, that the Dr. himself is but A JESUIT IN DISGUISE ! And I shall now more than hint at it. I shall actually proceed to lay some of this very singular "internal evidence" before my curious readers.

No. 1.—And I must begin by informing them, that, unaccountable as it may seem, to suppose an ostensible Puritanizer can be a secret tool of the Pope, that in times when such things were more notorious than they may now be, the very term "Puritan-Papist" became a matter of common parlance. Ample evidence upon this point may be had in the numerous and diversified references given in the 36th Note, p. 452, of my work on

the Puritans.* Wherefore, the Dr.'s ecclesiastical position is no defence at all for him. He may be an ostensible Presbyterian, or Congregationalist, and none the less a Jesuit for all that.

No. 2.—Next, comes the mysterious fact, that these Puritan-Papists were generally recruited from the ranks of those who had deserted the Church of England. Here, the "internal evidence" begins to assume a very suspicious hue. The more so, when that old stereotyped Jesuitical sneer, "the Church of Henry," falls unwarily from his lips. And yet, more, when we take into the account, that he maintains, what a Jesuit would of course maintain most sturdily, that while the Church of England is a mere human manufacture, Presbyterianism is not a particle the better. It has, for him, no *jure divino* warrant. He could change his position from the Presbyterian platform too, "*if circumstances should seem to call for it, or render it expedient!*" No doubt he could; for expediency is with a Jesuit a perfectly sovereign consideration. No coat suits him so well as one, like Joseph's, "of many colors."

No. 3.—Next, there was no topic on which the Puritan-Papists inveighed with more earnestness, "if circumstances should seem to call for it," than the Romanizing tendencies of the Church of England. They had the instinctive hatred of deserters, and did up their work *con amore*. And the accomplishment of such a work is one of Rome's darling projects; since (as the admission, in No. 4, shows,) she had rather ruin that one Church and its associates, than all the rest of Protestantism lumped together. The Doctor has labored assiduously to gratify Rome in this particular, and proved himself something better than those "raw recruits," which she drums up among half-fledged Episcopalians. He is a regular veteran in her service; and the internal evidence of his secret proclivities "pains us to the heart," as much as the woful spectacle of Episcopal derelictions distresses him, in his intervals of compassion.

No. 4.—Next, the Puritan-Papists were, every now and then, unmeasured in their abuse of Rome itself. This was one of their most peculiar and blinding stratagems; and requires a little elucidation. A Romish bishop, in this country, once confessed frankly, that his Church had nothing to apprehend from non-Episcopal Protestants. "They," said he, "so mix up stout abuse with flimsy argument, that they are really excellent helpers to our cause. Episcopalians," he added, "generally deal in valid authorities alone, and are the only Protestants of whom we have any serious fears."†

* With this may be compared some curiosities in Note 34th, p. 446, which, to some, may be about equal to the wonders disinterred at Nineveh, by Mr. Layard.

† This fact was stated to me by the very person, to whom the Romish bishop made the admission. That person and the bishop are now both deceased; but the remarkable fact was fixed indelibly in my memory, and I have often alluded to it.

The Dr. has proved an eminent co-adjutor of Romanism, in the way specified by the Romish bishop. And the beauty of such an operation is its perfect safety among the unthinking and uneducated. The hearty vituperator of Rome escapes common observation, like the cuttle-fish, in a cloud of his own ink! The "internal evidence" of the Doctor's secret Jesuitism is now rendered formidably significant.

No. 5.—Next, and in most mysterious juxtaposition with the preceding "internal evidence," comes the fate of the Doctor's one-sided controversy with Abp. Hughes. The Abp. treated his letters (so said) with silent contempt. Now the Abp. is too deep a diplomatist, to be influenced by such a gross, every-day motive as that. He was silent, then, because he knew that the Doctor (no "raw recruit") was following his proper vocation; and, really, if indirectly, carrying out the aims of his superiors. The Abp. is unquestionably accounted a paragon of astuteness; he knows how to demean himself towards subordinates, so as to accomplish ulterior ends.

No. 6.—Next, come some of his Jesuitical tendencies, breaking loose, in spite of all ordinary precaution. A Jesuit's appetency for papal thunders, is one of his easiest self-betrayments. But the Dr. puts himself, *by instinct*, into the chair-catholic of all non-episcopal Protestants, grasps the whole heft of an interdict, and consigns my lecture to ecclesiastical outlawry, as "a most unworthy production." Oh, how he would like to be a genuine pope, and not a mere popeling;

And prove his doctrine orthodox,
By apostolic blows and knocks!

He must be on his guard against this dangerous "internal evidence," of too great fondness for pontifice authority. His real character will be inevitably blazoned if he is not more circumspect.

No. 7.—Next, comes his incontestable familiarity with the old school-logic, so famous in the worst eras of Romanism in the Middle Ages. One of the arguments of this logic was called *argumentum ad invidiam*, or an argument addressed to envy. In other words, (since envy is here put by synechdoche for *all* the bad passions,) an argument addressed to the ugly jealousies of human nature, when you can only enlist them in your behalf. The Doctor's method of conducting controversy displays a most melancholy familiarity with this sort of logic; and proves, but too clearly, what has been bred in the bone with him.

No. 8.—Next, comes a most unfortunate exhibition of Jesuitic art, leaking out in spite of that extreme wariness enjoined *mandato superiorum*.*

* Comp, Hospinian Hist. Jesuit, p. 393.

For instance. He hides behind a technicality, when he discovers at last that it is impossible for him to conceal from an unsophisticated public, that he has been reviewing a reporter, and not me. "This sketch is all I have reviewed," he says. Now nothing is commoner than for a Jesuit, when caught *in flagrante delicto*, to dodge behind a technicality, like an Indian behind a tree. The Doctor's case now becomes a sore one. "It reads badly."

Nos. 9, 10, 11.—Next, come three more specimens of art Jesuitic, which, for brevity's sake, I throw into one category. First, he maintains that I ought to have repudiated the sketch, if it was not mine.* Now, as Pascal informs us in his Provincial Letters, it is a favorite mode of warfare with the Jesuits, to find fault with an opponent in advance, to prevent his finding fault with yourself. (*Pascal's Wks. ii. 278, etc. Eng. ed.*) Not a word hints he about the very plain obligation of courtesy, on his part, to ask me, as he might have done an hundred times, if the sketch had any authority. He passes my door daily, and has done so, ever since I have lived here; but his shadow is unknown to my threshold. He knew very well that his plea was a wrong one; and so he would dexterously throw the *onus probandi* off from his own shoulders, and let it press upon mine. Such Jesuitism becomes somewhat rancid, when mixed up with two or three more unsavory elements; and its odor cannot be stifled. One of these elements, (No. 10,) is an acting upon probable opinions, instead of genuine facts. (*Pascal, ii, 62, 68.*) The Jesuitical rule is, that the opinion of "a single doctor" is a sufficient ground for action. He had this "internal evidence," that the sketch was indubitably mine; and so he adopted that opinion as an abundant warrant. Another of these elements, (No. 11,) is the "correcting viciousness in means, by the goodness of an end." (*Pascal, ii. 98.*) The Doctor's *end* being satisfactory to himself and his spiritual directors, the *means* which he employs to accomplish it, are of inferior consequence.

No. 12.—I have reached a number in this catalogue, as large as the Doctor's own in controversial philippics; and it is high time to stop, lest we become embarrassed by the desolate and expanding prospect, and are forced to cry out with Goldsmith's wanderer—

Where wilds immeasurably spread,
Seem lengthening as I go!

I must therefore close this terrific series, by the utterance of a pitying fear, that the Doctor may have been taking lessons out of a deplorable

* It was more than repudiated, by a promise of the Lecture itself, just as his long series of papers began. That promise appeared *before* his third paper. And there is something more than "internal evidence" to show, that Dr. B. saw it with his own eyes.

treatise, on the proper rules for mental equivocation, supposed to be written by the Jesuit Garnet, and republished by D. Jardine, Esq., Barrister at Law, in London, 1851.* I dare not touch the *Secreta Monita*, or the *Constitutiones*, or Meyrick's summary of the Moral Theology of Liguori, lest I have to begin my list of "internal evidences" anew. The little treatise referred to, talks openly of "the convenient times of honest dissimulation;" (p. 56;) while the Preface informs us, it was one of Garnet's acknowledged principles of conduct, that equivocation was lawful "in cases of necessary self-defence." (p. xxii.) Comp. Hospinian's *Historia Jesuitica*, p. 370.)

Really, such a mountainous accumulation of "internal evidence," with the untold possibilities of more, becomes inexpressibly worse than ten hundred "impassioned hyperboles." It behoves the Doctor, without delay, instead of stopping to throw stones at his neighbors, to be looking sharply, not after the shingles only, but the rafters of his own ecclesiastical domicile. If he delays, he may be covered, some stormy day, with most unorthodox ruins. For the denial of Jesuitical marks and characteristics, with silent contempt, or the broadest amazement, with scorn, ridicule, or even with execration, may not avail him, one whit more than similar denials have helped the Jesuits themselves, when they have repudiated the *Secreta Monita*, or the *Constitutiones*, or their entire system of morals, as depicted by Pascal in his graphic Provincial Letters. The peering eye of suspicion may fasten on him, let him frown upon its glances never so darkly. Its whispers may dog his footsteps, as he patrols the streets. It behooves him, therefore, to spend the best of his time, if not all his time hereafter, in attending to the portentous advice of an Apostle, about that duty of duties he has so much neglected, to "study to be quiet and to do his own business," and to let other people's business, and particularly, other people's faults, altogether alone. To quicken himself into wariness, he would do well to paste up in his study the terse and pointed admonition of one of Terence's colloquists,

*Nam si ego digna hac contumelia
Sum maxime, at tu indignus qui faceres tamen.*

Eunuchi, Act v. S. ii. 26.

As to Doctor Beman's assaults upon my integrity as a man, he coolly represents me as capable of presenting the Public, with a garbled edition of my Lecture, in order to evade his criticisms upon the newspaper sketch.

* Hospinian identified this in his *Historia Jesuitica*, published in 1670, at Zurich, p. 372. So it is a very ancient authority. See also Foulis's *Romish Treasons*, p. 700. Lond. 1671.

Indeed, he not only hints that I *can* forge, and *may* forge; but that in one portion of the Lecture, I *shall* do so, to a certainty. These are his own deliberate words: *littera scripta manet*.

“But if we have another edition, let it be the very sermon preached; and not one got up to suit a new set of circumstances.”

“If Dr. Coit should publish his own edition of this sermon, you may be assured he will revise this closing paragraph.”

Dr. Beman carefully informs his readers, that he is fond of judging a written production by its *spirit*, and a man by what shows the *animus* of his disposition. To turn his own rules upon himself, I shall simply say, that charges so disgraceful to their author are their own sufficient refutation.* They demonstrate indelibly, the *spirit* and the *animus* of the man who conceived, and pronounced them, and scattered them abroad:—of the man, I say, and not the gentleman; since they are incompatible with the dignity of gentlemanly and Christian refinement. Such a man is unworthy further notice; and I leave him with the wretched company he has chosen for an associate, his own dishonor.

* By the advice of a judicious friend, the original manuscript was not sent to the press, but an exact copy of it. The original is, accordingly, in a state of complete preservation, for the inspection of those magnanimous spirits, with whom “seeing is believing.”

The Edition of Dyer's Calvin referred to in the pamphlet is the English edition of John Murray, 1850, 1 vol. 8 vo. pp. 560.

NOTICE.

The following reprint of the Sketch of Dr. Coit's Lecture, as it appeared in the *Troy Daily Traveller*, of December 26, 1855, has been made with Dr. C.'s consent, and at the urgent request of gentlemen who never saw the Sketch, and were anxious to compare it with its prototype.

THE PUBLISHER.

The Rev. Dr. Coit's Christmas-Eve Sermon--The Episcopal Church vindicated from the charge of illiberality and exclusiveness.

A large congregation assembled at this church on Monday evening to witness the customary observance on the eve of the Christmas festival. The services commenced with an anthem; after which evening prayer was read by the Rev. Mr. Pennell, the Rev. Wm. Mulchahey pronouncing the Absolution and reading the concluding prayers. After the singing of an anthem, the Rector, the Rev. Dr. Coit, ascended the pulpit and delivered an able and very interesting sermon from the following text,—St. John, chap. 4th, verse 19th. “For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.”—The following is a sketch of Dr. Coit's remarks.

My brethren, it has long been customary in the Church, to embrace occasions like the present for apologies for what may by some be esteemed peculiarities in our faith and practice. A defence of our position being expected, and usage justifying the practice, I have thought proper on this occasion to repel the charge of *exclusiveness* which the enemies of the Church are continually preferring against her. The Jews of old held no communion with the Samaritans because they the Jews were the peculiar people of God. We are likewise accused of arrogating to ourselves exclusive pretensions of being the true Church of God, because we refuse in religious matters to have anything to do with the denominations around us. But, my brethren, this charge is founded upon a very erroneous conception of the true state of the case before us. It is true that as Churchmen we believe our Church to be the best and purest branch of the Church of Christ—the nearest in doctrine, discipline, and worship to that which our Lord and His Apostles set up on the earth. Of this we have not the shadow of a doubt. And was our Lord to appear now upon the earth we make no doubt but that amidst the multifarious forms of religious belief, our Church would be recognized by Him as nearest to that Church He established in the world. As questionable an assumption as this may seem to some present, it is nevertheless true that the thousand and one sects which surround us practically set up the very same preteosions. If the difference upon which their organizations are

based are not in their opinion essential and fundamental they are justly of the woful sin of schism in receiving the body of Christ, for his Church can be *but one*, for we have His Holy Word for the assurance that there is but "one Lord, one faith, and one baptism." Yes, *one not an hundred*. The various sects are thus involved in an inextricable dilemma. If they believe their difference to be essential and fundamental they exhibit the palpable inconsistency of opposing us for maintaining the peculiarities of one church upon the identical grounds upon which they justify their several organizations. On the other hand if they declare their peculiarities to be non-essential and matters of mere taste or preference they can by no sophistry or special pleading clear their skirts from woful guilt of schism. The truth is, my brethren, they claim no more, nor less than we. Each one thinks that his religious system is the best to serve God in here below, and to give him an easy transit to the joys above.

But this view of the case is not, by any means obvious so to our opponents. *They* are forever harping upon the exclusiveness and illiberality of our Church. *They* are for liberal opinions and liberal views—*such a liberality as will lead to our mutual allowance of conflicting degrees and theories*. But, my brethren, carry this species of reasoning to its legitimate conclusions and what is the result? Why, the result must be that no excessive looseness of principles and opinions carries off the palm of liberality. The man who has the fewest principles, and those of the most negative character, must be the most thriving pattern of imitation and example. But these special pleaders of liberality, after all, maintain some principles as fundamental and essential truth and as a test of orthodoxy, thus thwarting the operation of this very idea of liberality which is the oft repeated watch-word in all their contests with the church.

Let us, my brethren, drive this idea of liberality to its legitimate conclusions, and see where this boasted evidence of orthodoxy will lead us. The Presbyterian, the Baptist, the Methodist, is not so liberal but that the dimensions of his rule of liberal orthodoxy fail to cover the Socinian. But, according to the fundamental idea from which this erroneous notion respecting liberality in matters of faith proceed, the Socinian is the most liberal, and, as a consequence, the more just, charitable, and christian-like of the two. According to this theory there is a most commendable liberality in his creed. There are none of these cramping tests of orthodoxy that mar the beauty of this theory when applied to other systems.

But the Universalist has a still higher claim to consideration as a shining example of liberality and non-exclusiveness. In the final reckoning he is lenient towards all opinions and practices, and without regard to profession, principles or actions here below, throws open the doors of heaven wide, and invites all to the celestial repose above! If no boasted theory be true who shall condemn him? No one! He has made a most commendable progress in the path of light.

But, my brethren, we have not yet reached the ultimate conclusion to which our theory must lead us. The Deist gives us a still further test of his theory. The simplicity of his belief and his freedom from the maintenance of illiberal and uncharitable opinions are obvious. He ignores all such illiberal institutions as the church and its various accessories; and even exceeds the two last mentioned individuals in his liberality, as he does not, for the support of religious institutions, tax the pocket a single farthing!

In the pursuit of this liberal and charitable theory the Athiest even exceeds the Deist. With him God, heaven, hell, and eternity, are but a myth, and the whole human race are rewarded with annihilation. With him there is no accountability, and there can be no sin.

But, my brethren, the highest development of this theory is the fashionable, modern Pantheistic abstraction. With the Pantheist the whole universe is God—the heavens and the earth; man, beast, and vegetable, are all divine. All being divine there can be no error or sin. One thing is as much divine as another. Man himself is but a vegetable! He comes into existence, grows and decays like a tree! In this sublime climax of theoretical development we are brought into contact with the very prince of non-exclusives. In this last development the theory of our opponents reaches its legitimate consequences. God and eternity; virtue and vice; heaven and hell, are swept away; and on the chaotic element of an extinguished world. Pantheism rears its throne as the prince of non-exclusion, and reigns most supremely and most gloriously, as the ultimate exponent of the boasted theory of non-exclusiveness and liberality.

Advocate of the so-called charity and liberality are you willing to follow the logical deductions of your own own premises? Are you willing to submit to the supremacy of Pantheism? Or does your soul revolt from the loathsome embrace of so foul and execrable a delusion?

But my friends, consequences so revolting to all the better instincts of our nature, are but the lamentable results of erroneous premises. They spring from an unauthorized confounding of the heaven-born grace of Charity with the ideas and opinions of the intellect—the mind. Charity cannot be predicated of *the head*; consequently the rejection or maintenance of specific ideas or opinions, does not of itself effect the laws of Charity. This Christian grace springs, not from the head, but from *the heart*. Consider for a moment, St. Paul's beautiful description of charity: Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." Sublime description? The very essence of the graces of Christian soul! Yes, of the Christian soul, *not of the head, but of the heart*. The *head* does not suffer long; it does not bear all things, believe all things, hope all things, and endure all things. This is the province of *the heart*. The true Christian heart both suffers, bears, believes, hopes, and endures all things. In short, the law of charity there reigns supreme! The simple maintenance or rejection of destructive ideas and opinions does not and cannot of itself overlay or ignore the law of Christian charity.

This view of the case, my brethren, naturally leads us to the consideration of the question—What is uncharitableness and illiberality when applied to opinions and ideas? Uncharitableness, we are bold to say, has no reference to the maintenance or rejection of certain principles or opinions; but relates wholly to *the manner in which they are maintained or rejected*. We are not then to be assailed simply for maintaining the distinctive principles of our Church, provided we do so in due subjection to the law of charity. We are bound to take a charitable view of the motives and conduct of those whom we believe to be in error. But to follow or approve what we believe to be essential error, would be to make ourselves traitors to our own consciences, to Christ, and to His Church. A man may not be to blame for the maintenance of

errors. They may be the result of education, ignorance, mental obtuseness, or other providential causes. It does not follow, however, that we are bound to pare down and adulterate the essentials of doctrine, discipline and worship, that we may not be excluded from the standard of orthodoxy. The law of Christian charity does not demand it. On the contrary, while we judge the motives and conduct of others, with all the kindness and leniency which the law of Christian charity demands, every consideration of truth, loyalty and consistency, prompts us to the maintenance of those principles and doctrines which we believe to be essential to the integrity of the Christian Faith and the Christian Church.

It is thus made clear my brethren, that charity may not be predicated of the *head*, but of the *heart*. The maintenance of positive opinions does not, therefore, necessarily crush out the exercise of charity.

Calvin, the great leader and light of modern predestination, pitied the fate of the reprobate, while he maintained the inexorable decree which sealed his miserable destiny! His own heart, as it were, revolted at the horrible consequences of a theory which his intellect maintained and approved. But Calvin, when he undertook to enforce his opinions by high-handed power, lost even this claim to the name of Protestant? In bringing Servetus to the stake he was guilty of the most palpable inconsistency. The peculiar instruments of Roman inquisitorial power became the chosen implements for the promulgation of his own ideas and opinions.

But the Church of England, while maintaining her own principles, has ever shown herself tolerant in matters of opinion. Thus she tolerated Puritan principles while they were quietly maintained. But when the arm of Puritanism was raised to prostrate her in the dust, then she manfully withstood the assault. It was the darling object of Puritanism, not only to promulgate its own peculiar opinions, but at the same time in one fell swoop to blot out the existence of England's National Church, and cover her very name with the mantle of oblivion. The Church of England withstood the assault nobly and manfully. She fought for her life—her existence. Had the hands of Puritanism been strengthened by a continuance of power, the gallows would have reared its gloomy form in the streets of London as well as in the town of Boston.

Our church is made the object of continual attack. Our honor is assailed, like one careful of his honor we indignantly repel the accusations; and we challenge our opponents, one and all, to prove a single one of the allegations which like the war cries of a nation are continually sounded in our ears. Are we illiberal? let an answer be made. Episcopalians, it must be confessed, are accustomed to enunciate their opinions very plainly and very decidedly. I have yet to find, however, a body of persons who, while they maintain firmly their principles they consider essential to the integrity of their Faith, yet are more charitable and lenient in their judgment of the motives and conduct of those whom they believe to be in error. Even when pernicious error is apparent, they shrink from invading the sacred domain of the heart, the secret thoughts and motives of which are exposed to the eye of omniscience alone.

But the senseless charges of illiberality and uncharitableness is repeated again and again. But the whole face of the charge consists in simple assertion. Where are the proofs? Let see against whom this charge justly rests—our opponents or ourselves? It is said that we unduly exalt the Church and attach an undue importance to connection with it. Let us see how our opponents view this matter. Take for instance, the Presbyterian body, and what says to confession of Faith respecting the nature of the Church, and the importance of connection with it. After stating what it considers to be the Church, it comes out with those solemn and awfully important declarations, "*Out of which (i. e. the Church) there is no ordinary possibility of Salvation!*" Words of fearful import. Our Church, my friends, has never ventured to utter so sweeping an assertion. She asserts that from a variety of causes some men may fail to become united with the visible Church, and yet may be saved. Her summary of essentials may be found in the Church Catechism, wherein we are told that the two *sacraments*—Baptism and the Lords Supper—are the essentials: and that these are but "*generally necessary to salvation.*" Thus upon this point, some of the Church's most formidable opponents are condemned out of their own standards.

But there is another point from which we may judge of the Church's relative

position to other bodies. When one seeks to enter her fold, what is he required to promise and profess? Why, simply his belief in the Apostles' Creed, a formula so simple that no man who has the least pretensions to Christianity may presume to deny it, and his resolution to "renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all the covetous desires of the same, and the sinful desires of the flesh; and his determination, by God's help, to walk according to his professions all the days of his life. This is the sum and substance of the Church's tests for admission into her fold. How marked the contrast between her position and that of Romanism on the one hand, and ultra-Protestantism on the other. Rome leaving the *heart*, presents her exactions and requirements to the *head*. Whatever may be the state of one's intellectual organs, it inexorably demands that the Creed of Pope Pius IV, together with the accumulated interpolations and incrustations of ages of development, be received and digested. Ultra-Protestantism, on the other hand, flies to the opposite extreme, and arrays its inquisitorial judgment upon the secret feelings and emotions of the heart. Its demands are as inexorable as the exactions of Pope Pius! It invades the domain of the Infinite, probes the secret recesses of the soul, and arrogating to itself that province of judgment over men's hearts which belongs to God alone, it has the daring presumption to receive, reject or condemn, according to the weak conclusion of finite judgment. My friends, between two such systems of error I could have no hesitation in the choice of the former, since the Romanist admits that some degree of mental ignorance, obliquity, or obtuseness, may be uncovered without absolute peril to the soul's salvation. In the latter case, if the heart is involved in serious obliquity, everything is lost!

There is yet, my friends, one other important point in the Church's system which demands our consideration, viz: her terms of communion. To whom is her invitation to participate in the highest and most sublime act of Christian worship addressed? Whom does she call upon to unite in the most sacred act of devotion which demands the attention of the Christian? She has but two forms of invitation. In the first her minister declares his intention, at the appointed time, "to administer to *all such as shall be religiously and devoutly disposed*, the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ." When the holy table is spread, her priest offers her second and last invitation, in the following gracious words:—*Ye who do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbors, and intend to lead a new life, following the Commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in His holy ways; draw near with faith, and take this Holy Sacrament to your comfort.*" But, it may be urged that we do not call upon other Christians by the names of their respective denominations. Indeed, why should we? In this holy and sacred Communion with Christ, even the Church's own children are not known by the name which distinguishes their Church in the world. It is a sacred act in which the names of no individual or faction can intrude.

But, my brethren, it is not only in the matters to which I have alluded that the specious caviling of our opponents seeks to demonstrate our vulnerability. Our opinions are not only sneered at and assailed; but the power of perverse insinuation seeks to undermine our religious character. It is hard, hard indeed, for our opponents to believe in Episcopalian piety. We are charged with a formalism at once most soulless and destructive; and a clinging to sacramental rites destitute of the essence of faith, or religious vitality. And after having achieved the most glorious victories for Protestantism which the pages of history unfold, we are charged with being Papists in disguise. Our Liturgy is confounded with the mummeries of Popery, and our Church itself is considered the natural ally of Rome. The clamor of our adversaries fain would imitate the aspirations of Jerusalem's opponents of old, who, viewing the Holy City in her beautiful garments, burst out in those exclamations so significant of destructive desire, "Raise it! raise it! *even to the ground!*"

What may be the future of our Church we know not. It may be that calumny and detraction is still further to exhaust itself upon us. Hope deferred may yet sicken our hearts. But the struggle must be maintained. Our duty is before us. God is above us: and there rises into view the inspired declaration of the Apostle: "All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come, all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's."